

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1882.

ARTICLE I.—PENTATEUCH-CRITICISM: ITS HISTORY AND
PRESENT STATE.

PART FIRST.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST, D. D.

OLD TESTAMENT criticism has of late years awakened a marked degree of attention in circles where, but a short period ago, the questions now so widely and earnestly discussed were hardly known to exist, or, if known, were quietly ignored, because they were regarded as dangerous to the faith. This is especially true of the question concerning the origin and composition of the Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch, in as much as, according to the critics, the question relates not only to the Five Books of Moses, but to Joshua as well.

It is not difficult to account for the livelier interest in critical discussions manifested at the present time by the English-speaking theological public. Our age has been led by various causes to the necessity of a larger and fuller recognition of the human and historical side of the Bible, than has been bestowed upon it in the past; and it is just with this side that criticism deals in seeking to give the literary history of the Canonical books. Germany has long been the center of Biblical science, as well in its best as in its worst forms; and whether for good or for

evil, German books treating of questions of criticism are being rapidly translated, and are now as accessible to the cultivated layman as to the professional theologian. Many young men of the ablest minds and the most brilliant promise go from England and America to pursue their theological studies at the universities of Germany, where they hear these disputed topics discussed with wonderful learning and acumen, yet at the same time with startling freedom and often with painful irreverence. The case of Prof. Robertson Smith, which was followed with interest by the secular as well as religious journals, and his late book, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, which has found an extensive circle of readers, have forced critical questions, especially that of the Pentateuch, on the notice even of the general public. Indeed, it is not possible to read the magazines or even the newspapers, to say nothing of learned Reviews and theological Quarterlies, without being confronted, at least in the book-notices, with such terms as the "Elohist," the "Jehovist," the "Deuteronomist," the "Redactor," and others, which are perplexing, perhaps quite unintelligible, to many otherwise well-informed minds. It may not be amiss, then, to give the past history and the present state of the Pentateuch controversy. It will enable many who have neither the time nor the facilities for a personal investigation, to follow more intelligently the discussions which are now going forward, and which, we feel sure, will in the near future, assume a still greater importance. At all events, the subject forms an interesting and instructive chapter in the history of theological thought, and as such, is well worthy of study.

Our purpose in the following article is not to offer a new hypothesis for the explanation of the many perplexing difficulties that meet us on every page of the Pentateuch. Neither is it to advocate any one of the numerous hypotheses already presented. It is not even to criticise them, to set forth their merits or defects. The aim we have in view is purely historical—to trace the objective movement of thought on the origin and composition of the first five, or rather six, books of the

Old Testament. And it will be our endeavor to give a clear exposition of the several theories that have successively arisen, and especially to exhibit the present state of the question and the attitude of the parties now in conflict.

I. PATRISTIC AGE.

The traditional view, which has been inherited from the ancient Jewish Church, and has maintained its credit till a comparatively recent date, ascribes the whole Pentateuch in its present form to the great lawgiver, Moses. It seems to have been universally prevalent in the time of our Lord and His disciples. At least we know of no doubts expressed at that early day as to the Mosaic authorship. The Pentateuch was currently known by the name of "Moses;" and under this name Jesus appeals to it on various occasions (Mark xii. 26; Luke xxiv. 27, 44; John v. 46, 47); though it would be too much, perhaps, to say, that such appeal stamps its Mosaic authorship with the seal of His divine authority, inasmuch as He also refers to the Psalter under the name of "David," the name by which it was designated in His day, though the larger part of the Psalter does not claim to have been written by the royal Psalmist of Israel.

Yet, that Moses wrote the five books which bear his name was unquestionably the opinion of the ancient Jews, and is expressly stated by Philo and Josephus. And so in the Talmud in a passage* relating to the authorship of the Biblical books, it is said "Moses wrote his book, and the section concerning Balaam," which indeed forms part of the Pentateuch, but seems to be distinguished from the remainder, because it stands in no near relation to the purposes of the Law. Immediately after it is added, "Joshua wrote his book and eight *pesukim* of the Law;" viz., Deut. xxxiv. 5-12, where the death of Moses is narrated; though even these verses, according to

* The whole passage is given in the original by Strack in his article *Kanon des Alten Testaments*, in Herzog's *Real Encyclopaedie*, 2nd Ed. Vol. vii. pp. 417, 418.

another opinion given in the Talmud, were written by Moses at the dictation of God.

The Jewish tradition as to the origin of the Pentateuch was naturally adopted by the Christian Church without special inquiry into its correctness. Occasion for such inquiry was indeed not wanting; for Celsus, a heathen philosopher of the second century, had attacked the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and his attack would, in any other age, have led to an historical and critical investigation of the subject. But the interest of the Church Fathers lay, not in determining who wrote the books of the Old Testament,—for on this point, as not of primary importance, they were willing to accept without question the opinions of the Synagogue—but in ascertaining their true meaning, their right limits and their relation to the Canon of the New Testament. Even if they had had the disposition to engage in scientific critical researches into the Hebrew Scriptures, most of them lacked the qualifications indispensable to success. With few exceptions, they had no acquaintance with the original language, and were dependent for their knowledge of the Old Testament on the Septuagint version. Almost the only competent scholar among them all was Jerome, and he perhaps felt the difficulty of attributing the Pentateuch, in its present form, to Moses; for he remarks: “Whether you wish to say that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, or that Ezra is its restorer, I have no objection.”*

The Mosaic authorship was denied by some of the heretics in the early Church, especially by the Gnostics, who were bitter enemies of the Jewish Law. In the second century, Ptolemæus, a scholar of Valentinus, in speaking of the origin of the Law distinguished between several parts, one of which he attributes to divine revelation, another to Moses, and a third to the elders of the people; and though he does not expressly say that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, yet it is not probable that, with such a view of the origin of its contents, he

* “*Sive Mosen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi sive Eoram ejusdem instauratorem operis non recuso.*” *Contra Helvidium.*

would ascribe to him the literary composition of the whole book."*

The Nazarenes, an ascetic sect of which Epiphanius speaks, rejected the Pentateuch as fictitious, and maintained that though Moses had indeed received a scheme of laws from heaven, it was not that contained in this work.† The author of the Clementine Homilies says that the law was only given orally by Moses to the seventy elders, that it was designed to be perpetuated by word of mouth, but that, contrary to his intention, it was consigned to writing after his death. Subsequently it was often lost, and as often written out anew with numerous additions and changes, and thus became more and more corrupted with the lapse of time. A statement of this kind, coming unsupported from an heretical source, may seem to be of little account; "it is however remarkable," as Perowne justly remarks,‡ "so far as it indicates an early tendency to cast off the received traditions respecting the books of Scripture; whilst at the same time it is evident that this was done cautiously, because such an opinion respecting the Pentateuch was said to be for the advanced Christian only, and not for the simple and unlearned."

II. MEDIEVAL AGE.

Almost nothing was done for Biblical science by the Church theologians of the Middle Ages. The overshadowing influence of papal authority left them little freedom for investigation, and throughout this long period they simply maintained the traditions received from the Fathers of the early Church.

It was different, however, among the Jews; they had many learned scholars, who devoted themselves diligently to the study of Hebrew and the interpretation of the Old Testament;

* Bleek's Introduction to the Old Testament, English translation, Vol. i. p. 192.

† Bleek, *ibid.*

‡ See his Art. Pentateuch, in Smith's Dict. of the Bible. Am. ed. Vol. iii. p. 2409.

and it is certain from what is known of their opinions that not a few exercised considerable freedom in conducting their critical investigations. There were those who distinctly affirmed that whole sections of the Pentateuch were written at different periods long after Moses, though in general they were obliged to disguise their disbelief for fear of the more numerous and powerful party that still clung to the ancient traditions. Some of these treatises have perished, whilst others are still in manuscript, buried in unknown libraries; but enough can be gathered of their opinions from desultory quotations to show that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in its present form was not the universal belief of the Jewish scholars in the Middle Ages.

Isaac Ben Jasos, or, more properly, Isaac Ben Salomo Israeli, a very distinguished physician, philosopher, and Hebraist, of Kairwan, North Africa, who was born about A. D. 845, and died 940, maintained that the section in Gen. xxxvi, concerning the kings who reigned over Edom before kings ruled over Israel, was written in the time of Jehosaphat, king of Judah; and it is probable from the high position which he occupied, and from the fact that the distinguished grammarian, Dunash B. Tamim was among his disciples, that his belief in the late authorship of whole sections of the Pentateuch was shared by many of his contemporaries. Yet his exegetical treatise has not been preserved, and we know it only from an incidental quotation by Ibn Ezra (died 1167) on Gen. xxxvi. 31; who humorously remarks that he is justly called Isaac (*Laughter*), because whoso reads his commentary will laugh at it, in allusion to Gen. xxi 6, and says that his book deserves to be burnt. But this must not be taken seriously; it is simply a cloak to hide his own disbelief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in its present form.

This is evident from the doubts which he, in his commentary, has thrown out as to the Mosaic authorship of certain passages. On Gen. xii. 6: "And the Canaanite was then in the land," Ibn Ezra says: "It may be that the Canaanite took the land

of Canaan from others; accordingly the particle in question would denote *already*; but if it is not so, then there is a mystery in it, and the prudent will be silent." Again, on Gen. xxii. 14, "in the mount of the Lord it shall appear," he remarks, "Its import will be found in the Pericope *Debarim*, *i. e.*, in the beginning of Deuteronomy. On Deut. i. 1, the next place where Ezra manifests his doubts about the Mosaic authorship, and to which he especially refers, he remarks on the clause, "the other side of Jordan" (A. V., "on this side Jordan"): "If thou understandest the mystery 'of the twelve,' as well as of 'and Moses wrote,' 'and the Canaanite was then in the land,' also of 'in the mount of the Lord it shall appear,' of 'behold his bedstead was a bedstead of iron,' then wilt thou know the truth." And lastly on Deut. xxxiv. 1, "and Moses went up," he remarks: "According to my opinion Joshua wrote it from this verse; for after Moses went up into the mount he wrote no more, and he (Joshua) wrote it by inspiration. This is evident from the words, 'And God showed him (Moses) the land' (Deut. xxxiv. 1), 'and God said to him' (verse 4), 'and he buried him' (verse 6).

In the first half of the century, Joseph B. Eleazer Tob Elem wrote by request a super-commentary on Ibn Ezra's commentary. R. Joseph's treatise in its original form is still in manuscript, and we shall give his explanations of Ibn Ezra's remarks. "Ibn Ezra means that if the particle denotes *then*, Moses could not have written the words, but that Joshua or another and later prophet has added them. Now, it is all the same whether Moses or another prophet wrote them, they are alike trustworthy and inspired words. It is only in the legal but not in the historical portions of the Pentateuch that such a view is to be rejected. As the simple, however, cannot understand the difference between the legal and historical part, it is better to keep quiet."

Again, Ibn Ezra remarks on Gen. xxii. 14, that the meaning of the words will be found in Deut. i. 1. R. Joseph explains as follows:

"The mount of the Lord, according to Ibn Ezra, is Moriah, on which the Temple was built. This was revealed in the time of David; Moses did not know it, and hence could not write, 'On the mount of the Lord the people will appear before God,' and still less could he preface it by the words, 'As it is said to this day.' Accordingly a later prophet wrote this."

On the celebrated classical passage in Deut. i. 1, R. Joseph says: "The words at the beginning of Deuteronomy Ibn Ezra takes to be a later superscription, which states that all the precepts contained in the following sections were given by Moses in the places mentioned. Such late additions are also the last twelve verses of the Pentateuch, which record the going up and death of Moses on Mount Nebo. For after Moses ascended the mount he did not come down again to continue the Pentateuch, but Joshua continued it. Moreover, when it is said, 'And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests' (Deut. xxxi. 9), this too can only have proceeded from a later writer."

As to the words, "And the Canaanite was then in the land" (Gen. xii. 6), R. Joseph's remark on this passage has already been given. On, "Behold his bedstead was a bedstead of iron," etc. (Deut. iii. 2), R. Joseph says: "This, according to Ibn Ezra, likewise belongs to a later writer. For the words, 'Og's bedstead is in Rabbath, the capital of the children of Ammon,' are the record of one who saw it on the spot. As Moses, however, never entered the territory of the Ammonites, he could not know anything about it; nor could any later writer know it before the time of David, when Rabbath was conquered. Hence this verse was written in or after the time of this monarch." *

It is evident, therefore, that the learned Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages did not ascribe the authorship of the whole

* For these extracts, as well as for statements concerning the Mediæval Jews, we are indebted to a review of the "Speaker's Commentary" in the *British Quarterly* for January, 1872.

Pentateuch in its present form to Moses. Men like Isaac Israeli, in the ninth century, Ibn Ezra in the twelfth, and Joseph Tob Elem in the fourteenth, held that the legal enactments proceeded from him, but that the historical portions were added at various times by different inspired writers.

III. MODERN AGE.

It was Protestantism that gave birth to Biblical science. It did so necessarily, inasmuch as it regards the Bible as the sole rule of faith; yet not immediately, for the Reformers were engaged in the practical work of establishing their faith in opposition to the Roman Church; and as the traditions concerning the origin of the books of Scripture were not doubted, they paid little attention to questions of Introduction, accepting the beliefs handed down from earlier ages. But if the formal principle of the Reformation is valid, it is necessary to know what the Bible is, what are its limits, what is its true text, what is the history of its several books and various other questions, the right answer to which is essential, if the Bible is to be the supreme authority in matters of faith and life. And, accordingly, only since the Reformation have these subjects been earnestly and sincerely discussed.

The controversy concerning the Pentateuch has, since the Reformation, passed through several stages, each of which is an advance on its predecessor.

At first those who denied that the Pentateuch in its present shape came from the hand of Moses, maintained that, while its substance is Mosaic, the form in which it has come down to us is due to Ezra or some other inspired man, who, at a later time, made additions more or less extensive, and alterations more or less numerous, to render it more intelligible to after generations. This view, which, as we have just seen, was that of representative Jews of the Middle Ages, was based on the presence of traces of what seemed to be a later hand, as seen in numerous passages regarded as post-Mosaic, such as the account of Moses' death, and others, enumerated already by

Ibn Ezra, and in the use of names, such as Hebron and Dan, which had no existence before the age of the conquest and the Judges.

This view of a late authoritative recension of the Pentateuch with necessary interpolations and changes has never ceased to find advocates. Andreas Masius, a Catholic lawyer (died 1573), held that the Pentateuch, originally written by Moses, was re-written by Ezra, or some other inspired man, who altered many ancient names into those common at a later period, and introduced other changes to make it more easily understood.*

It is the view entertained by many older orthodox scholars, and in its best form is well set forth by Prideaux in his *Connections* (1716-1718) where, speaking of the literary activity of Ezra, he says: "The third thing which Ezra did about the Holy Scriptures, in his edition of them, was, he added, in several places, throughout the books of this edition what appeared necessary for the illustrating, connecting, or completing of them; wherein he was assisted by the same Spirit by which they were at first wrote. Of this sort we may reckon the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which giving an account of the death and burial of Moses, and of the succession of Joshua after him: it could not be written by Moses himself, who undoubtedly was the penman of all the rest of that book. It seems most probable that it was added by Ezra at this time. And such also may we reckon the several interpolations which occur in many places of the Holy Scriptures. For that there are such interpolations, is undeniable; there being many passages through the whole sacred writ, which create difficulties, that can never be solved without the allowing of them. As for instance (Gen. xii. 6), it is remarked, on Abraham's coming into

* In the preface to his Commentary on the Book of Joshua, published at Antwerp in 1574, the year after his death, he says: "Pentateuchum longo post Mosen tempore, interjectis saltem hic illuc verborum et sententiarum clausulis veluti sarcinum, atque omnino explicati redditum esse;" and on Ch. xix. 47: "Neque Mosis libros sic ut nunc habentur ab illo esse compositos certum est; sed ab Ezra aut alio quopiam divino viro, qui pro vetustis et exoletis locorum nominibus, quibus rerum gestarum memoria posset optime et perspici et conservari, reposuerit."

the land of Canaan, that the Canaanites *were then in the land*; which is not likely to have been said till after the time of Moses, when the Canaanites being extirpated by Joshua, were then no more in the land. And (Gen. xxii. 14,) we read, "As it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." But Mount Moriah (which is the mount there spoken of) was not called the mount of the Lord till the Temple was built on it, many hundred years after. And this being here spoken of it is a proverbial saying, that obtained among the Israelites in after ages, the whole style of the text doth manifestly point at a time after Moses, when they were in possession of the land in which this mountain stood. And therefore both these particulars prove the words cited to have been an interpolation. Gen. xxxvi. 3, it is written: "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the land of Israel." Which could not have been said till after there had been a king in Israel; and therefore they cannot be Moses' words, but must have been interpolated afterward. Exodus xvi. 35, the words of the text are: "And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, till they came to a land inhabited. They did eat manna till they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan." But Moses was dead before the manna ceased; and therefore these cannot be his words, but must have been inserted afterward. Deuteronomy ii. 12, it is said, "The Horims also dwelt in Seir before time, but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them before them and dwelt in their stead, as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them." Which could not have been written by Moses, Israel having not till after his death entered into the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them. Deuteronomy iii. 11, it is said, "Only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron. Is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon?" The whole style and strain of which text, especially that of the last clause of it, plainly speaks it to have been written a long while after

that king was slain; and therefore it could not be written by Moses, who died within five months after. In the same chapter, verse 14, it is said, "Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the country of Argob, unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maacath, and called them after his own name, Bashan-Havoth-Jair, unto this day." Where the phrase *unto this day*, speaks a much greater distance of time after the fact related, than those few months in which Moses survived after that conquest; and therefore what is there written must have been inserted by some other hand than that of Moses, long after his death. * * * * * Many more instances of such interpolated passages might be given. For throughout the whole Scriptures they have been frequently cast in by way of parenthesis, where they have appeared necessary for the explaining, connecting, or illustrating the text, or the supplying what was wanting in it. But those already mentioned are sufficient to prove the thing. Of which interpolations undoubtedly Ezra was the author, in all the books which passed his examination, and Simon the Just of all the rest which were added afterward; for they all seemed to refer to those latter times. But these additions do not detract anything from the divine authority of the whole, because they were all inserted by the direction of the same Holy Spirit which dictated all the rest. This as to Ezra is without dispute, he being himself one of the divine penmen of the Holy Scriptures; for he was most certainly the writer of that book of the Old Testament which bears his name; and is, upon good grounds, supposed to be the author of two more, that is, of the two books of Chronicles, as perchance also he was of the book of Esther. And, if the books written by him be of divine authority, why may not every thing else be so which he had added to any of the rest, since there is all reason for us to suppose that he was as much directed by the Holy Spirit of God in the one as he was in the other? The great importance of the work proves the thing; for as it was necessary for the Church of God that this work should be done, so also was it necessary for the work, that the

person called thereto should be thus assisted in the completing of it.

"He changed the old names of several places that were grown obsolete, putting, instead of them, the new names by which they were called at that time; that the people might the better understand what was written. Thus (Genesis xiv. 14,) Abraham is said to have pursued the kings, who carried Lot away captive, as far as Dan; whereas the name of that place was Laish, till the Danites, long after the death of Moses, possessed themselves of it, and called it *Dan, after the name of Dan their father*; (*) and therefore it could not be called Dan in the original copy of Moses, but that name must have been put in afterwards, instead of that of Laish, on this review. And so in several places in Genesis, and also in Numbers, we find mention made of Hebron; whereas the name of that city was Kirjath Arba, till Caleb, having obtained the possession of it after the division of the land, called it Hebron, after the name of Hebron, one of his sons; and therefore that name could not to be in the text, till placed there long after the time of Moses, by way of exchange for that of Kirjath Arba, which it is not to be doubted was done at the time of this review. And many other like examples of this may be given, whereby it appears, that the study of those who governed the church of God in those times was to render the Scripture as plain and intelligible to the people as they could, and not to hide and conceal any of it from them." (†)

Others, however, not satisfied with the supposition of late authoritative insertions and alterations, went a step beyond, and refused, or at least hesitated, to ascribe to Moses the literary authorship of the Five Books. Already during the Reformation, Carlstadt in his *Libellus de Canonicis Scripturis* (1520), while asserting that Moses received his law by inspiration from God and gave it to the people, seriously questions

(*) Joshua xix. 47, Judges xviii. 29.

(†) Connexion of the History of the Old and New Testaments. Part. I. Book V.

whether he can in any sense be regarded as the writer of the books which bear his name. (*) That Moses is not the writer he says in another place, may be defended on account of the narrative of his death, which no one, *nisi plane dementissimus Mosi velut autori tribuet*. He even denies that Ezra is the writer, and finally concludes that the authorship of the Mosaic history is uncertain, and not even agreed upon among the Jews. (†)

In the second half of the seventeenth century the genuineness of the Pentateuch was violently assailed. Hobbes in his "Leviathan" (1651) remarks that the Pentateuch was written rather *about* Moses, than *by* Moses, but admits that Moses may be the author of that part of Deuteronomy which is expressly said to have been written by him.

Peyrere (a divine of the French Reformed Church, who afterward abandoned Protestantism and died a Jesuit in 1676) in his remarkable book, *Systema Theologicum ex Praeadamitarum Hypothesi*, 1655, is unwilling to concede as much as Hobbes. He refers nothing directly to Moses, but supposes that the Jewish law-giver and leader wrote diaries in a fragmentary and hasty way (*carptim et raptim*), from which others made extracts, and that these extracts variously corrupted, became at a later time the basis of our books. This opinion he rests, not only on the passages which have been viewed as post-Mosaic, but also on what he regards as the obscurity of the Pentateuch, its confused arrangement, its manifold repetitions, and its historical contradictions.

More important is the treatment of this question by Spinoza in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (1670). Starting with the doubts obscurely intimated by Ibn Ezra, he seeks to prove that the Pentateuch, far from having proceeded from Moses, was actually written centuries later; and in confirmation of

(*) "Certum est, Mosen legem Dei divinitus acceptam populo dedisse, verum cuius sit dictio quinque librorum atque sermonis filum, dubitare potest."

(†) "Autorem historie Mosaice scriptorem incertum esse, neque inter Judeos convenire."

this opinion, he adduces a nearly complete series of the post-Mosaic passages. He points out the close connection between the historical books, showing how one links on to the other; and from this, and various other phenomena scattered throughout these books, infers that a single historian wrote the antiquities of the Jews, from their earliest origin to the destruction of the Temple. This historian, he conjectures, was Ezra, whose design it was partly to teach the laws of Moses and partly to record the history of their fulfillment. He first wrote Deuteronomy, a hortatory exposition of the law; then, perceiving the interest of the people, he prefaced Deuteronomy with the historical and legal parts, and afterward continued the history to the time of the Captivity. Still, this book did not receive his finishing touches, and after his death underwent many corruptions.

These, however, were only the opinions of individual scholars, and found no general acceptance. The Mosaic authorship was almost universally held, especially after Heidegger, Witsius, and, above all, Carpzov, bending their energies to its defence sought to meet the objections hitherto raised. The criticism of the Pentateuch was as yet in its infancy; its steps were weak and unsteady. The results at which it arrived were mainly negative, nor are they of much importance before the time of Astruc, who broke a new path which has been followed ever since.

Astruc is the author of the *Documentary Theory*, which supposes that the Pentateuch is of a composite character, and that it was compiled from two or more documents, each of which originally formed a continuous history of the same general subject and differed from the other in its modes of conception and manner of expression. These documents were at a later time combined by an editor who, selecting now from one and now from another, and retaining for the most part the very language of his sources, interwove the double or triple history into one according to a definite plan. It is as if some one should wish to write a life of Christ in the language of the

Bible, by compounding two or more of our Gospels into one, choosing part from this and omitting part from that, and arranging the extracts in a chronological order. Thus we should have a connected history, made up of distinctly discernible and easily separable parts; for in the case of two Gospels so widely different in style as, let us say, Matthew and John, it would not be a difficult task to sunder the parts taken from the one from those taken from the other.

This may serve to give a general idea of the theory, which, as was to be expected, has undergone various modifications at different hands. At first it was applied to Genesis alone; afterward to the Pentateuch as a whole; and still later, to Joshua as well. One critic assumes two documents, another three, and still another, even more than three. There are differences, moreover, as to the dates of the several documents; but, notwithstanding these modifications, the general basis is the same.

The foundations of this theory were laid by those theologians who began to suspect that in the composition of Genesis, Moses must have employed written sources, inasmuch as the events he records occurred centuries before his time. Such an opinion was expressed already by Vitrunga (Prof. in Franeker, died 1722), who, in his *Observationes Sacrae*, set it forth as his opinion that the patriarch wrote sketches, which Moses collected and arranged, and on the basis of which he composed the Book of Genesis. (*) He seems to have rested his opinion mainly on superscriptions, such as, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth," "of Adam," &c.

Richard Simon, priest of the Oratory at Paris, in his "Histoire Critique du vieux Testament" (1678), which is not without value even to this day, assumes three sources for the Pentateuch; first, ancient written memoirs or oral traditions from which Moses derived the narratives and genealogies in Genesis;

(*) "Schedas et scrinia Patrum apud Israelitas conservata Mosen opinamus collegisse, digessisse, ornasse, et ubi deficiebant compilasse, et iis priorem librorum suorum confecisse."

second, a record of the Law made by Moses himself; and third, the history of his own time which Moses caused to be written by official annalists.

A few years later, Clericus (Jean Le Clerc, professor of Hebrew in Amsterdam, (died 1736), in his *Sentimens* (1685), expressed the opinion that our present Pentateuch was the work of those priests whom the Assyrian King, after the destruction of the Kingdom of Israel, sent to instruct the Samaritan colonists in the worship of Jehovah (2 Kings xvii. 24—28), and who, with this object in view, wrote an account of the creation of the world, of the history of the people of Israel, and of the giving of the Law, deriving their historical material from old written sources, such as the Book of the Wars of the Lord, mentioned in Num. xxi. 14. And though in his Commentary on Genesis (1693), Clericus retracted this opinion and defended the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, he still maintained that Moses compiled the book of Genesis from ancient documents written by the Patriarchs.

All these conjectures, however, with reference to the sources, written or oral, made use of by Moses, were only preparatory to the work which Astruc did. He is the real father of the modern criticism of the Pentateuch, and his importance in this view demands a fuller account of him and his book. (*)

Jean Astruc was born 1684 in Languedoc. His father was a Protestant clergyman, who soon after the birth of this son went over to the Roman Catholic Church. Astruc, after receiving his preparatory education from his father, studied medicine, and in 1731 was made Professor in the Royal College at Paris, where he died in 1766. It was in 1753, when he was almost seventy years old, that he, a layman, published his conjectures, (†) the fruit of many years of study devoted to the

(*) The reader who wishes to see the details of Astruc's criticism of Genesis is referred to Böhmer's Article "Astruc" in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*.

(†) The full title, which explains the purpose of this book is, *conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paraît que moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse.*

Pentateuch. He published it anonymously. Indeed, fearing that free thinkers might misuse his conclusions to disparage the divine authority of the Pentateuch, he hesitated about publishing it at all, until a very pious scholar assured him that Fleury and Le François, whom he names together with Clericus and Richard Simon as his predecessors, shared his assumption of the employment of sources.

Astruc on his part introduced something new. He held, not merely that documents were used in the composition of Genesis, but that the chief of these documents were originally continuous histories which it is possible to reconstruct in the main after analyzing Genesis into its constituent elements. He was thus the first to propose and attempt to solve the problem of Pentateuch analysis, which has ever since, with increasing interest, engaged the minds of those critics who reject the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship.

Astruc was led to his opinion by observing the surprising fact, noticed already by Tertullian and Augustine, that, throughout Genesis and up to Exodus vi., the two divine names Elohim and Jehovah occur in groups, so that a section in which the name Elohim is used exclusively or at least predominantly, (e. g. Gen. i. 1-ii. 8, where only Elohim occurs, and thirty-seven times), is followed by another section in which there is an equally constant use of the name Jehovah (as e. g. Gen. ii. 4-iv. 26, where Jehovah or Jehovah Elohim occurs about thirty times and Elohim only four times). As he saw no apparent internal reason for this remarkable interchange of the divine names, he concluded that it must be explained by a difference of authors, one of whom named God Elohim, while the other named him Jehovah. Hence he assumed two chief documents, an Elohim document and a Jehovah document, which Moses, whom he regarded as the author of the Pentateuch, made the basis of Genesis.

Astruc, as we have said, conceived the idea of resolving Genesis and reconstructing the documents from which it was compiled. With this view, he sundered the Elohim sections

which he placed in a column marked A from the Jehovah sections which he placed in another column marked B. But as he advanced in his analysis, he thought it necessary to assume ten other sources, though the fragments of these form but a small part of the book. As the results of this first attempt are interesting, especially when compared with the latest critical analyses, we give them for the first eleven chapters, as far as the history of Abraham :

Elohim sections : i-ii. 3; v.; vi. 9-22; vii. 6-10, 19, 22; viii. 1-19; ix. 1-10, 12, 16, 17; xi. 10-26. *Jehovah sections* : ii. 4; iv. 26; vi. 1-8; vii. 1-5; 11-18, 21; viii. 20-22; ix. 11, 13-15, 18-27; x-xi. 9.

Besides these, two verses in ch. vii. from another source. It will be seen by those who have any acquaintance with the Pentateuch criticism of to-day, that it has found nothing to correct in Astruc's analysis of the first six chapters (for iv. 25 and v. 29 are, he thinks, additions by the compiler), and comparatively little in the last five.

Astruc saw the advantages of his hypothesis and set them forth in full. He states four. First, it gives a perfectly satisfactory solution of the difficulty experienced in the singular interchange of the divine names; secondly, it accounts for the double narratives of the same events throughout the book; and he instances among others the two accounts of creation in distinct, successive sections (i-ii. 3, and ii. 4-25), and the interweaving of two parallel narratives in the history of the Deluge; thirdly, it explains the lack of chronological order, of which he adduces many instances; and fourthly, it acquits Moses of carelessness in writing; for Astruc entertained the absurd notion that his twelve documents were originally written in as many parallel columns, or, at least, in four, after the manner of a harmony of the Gospels, and that these columns at a later time came to be written continuously, one after another, so that through the ignorance or negligence of scribes, matters became somewhat confused.

A few years later, in 1762, Jerusalem, one of the most dis-

tinguished apologists of the last century, and at the same time one of the worthiest representatives of the tendencies of his age, called the attention of Biblical scholars (*) to the results of Astruc's criticism.

It was Eichhorn, however, who made them the common possession of science. He was professor of the Oriental Languages at Jena and afterwards at Göttingen (1827), and like Astruc, held to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, which he endeavored to prove, by arguments drawn both from its language and its history, to be the oldest portion of the Old Testament. Ezra, he contended, cannot have been its author, nor the high priest in the time of Josiah, nor yet the priests sent to the Samaritans. It cannot have been written during the period intervening between David and Joshua. To Moses alone can it be ascribed.

Eichhorn adopted Astruc's view of the origin of Genesis, which he was the first to name the Documentary Hypothesis (*Urkunden-hypothese*). At the same time he simplified it and confirmed it by additional proofs. He assumed that Genesis was compiled chiefly from two pre-Mosaic records, an Elohistic and a Jehovahistic, the existence of which he sought to prove, 1, from the numerous *repetitions*, as, for example, in the narratives of the flood where two accounts are woven into one; 2, from the *style*, the Elohim-sections being marked by peculiar turns of thought and expression never found in the Jehovah-sections, and *vice versa*; and 3, from the *difference of character* of the two classes of sections. Thus, while Astruc confined his attention to the use of the divine names, Eichhorn studied the general characteristics, as to contents and language, of the different sections in which the several divine names occur, and so established new criteria for sundering the two documents.

In composing his narrative from these sources, the compiler, according to Eichhorn, selected from that document which gave the most detailed history of any particular event. Thus

(*) In his *Briefe über die Mosaischen Schriften und Philosophie*.

the history of Abraham and Isaac is mainly taken from the Jehovahistic document; that of Jacob and Joseph, from the Elohistic. Sometimes the compiler supplemented the account of one document by particulars taken from the other, and, in a few cases (as in ii. 4—iii. 24; xiv.; xxxvi.; xl ix.) inserted records borrowed from other sources. Later, Eichhorn took a step beyond his original position and applied the Documentary Theory to the Pentateuch in general. (*)

From Eichhorn we pass to Ilgen who introduced into the criticism of the Pentateuch a new feature, which, though neglected for half a century, was taken up by Hupfeld, and has since been retained by nearly all critics who reject the traditional view. It is the resolution of the book of Genesis into *three* documents, two Elohistic and one Jehovahistic. Karl David Ilgen was Professor of Philosophy and Oriental Literature in Jena. He was a man of large learning and considerable critical tact, who in pursuance of a broad historical plan entered upon a laborious critical analysis of Genesis, the results of which he has given in his *Documents of the Archives of the Temple at Jerusalem in their Original Form*, published at Halle, 1798.† After giving, in the first half of the book, a translation of his amended text of Genesis, divided into seventeen sections and accompanied with learned critical notes explaining and justifying his textual alterations, he treats in the second half of the separation of the documents, which enter into the composition of Genesis. The possibility of such separation lies in the composite character of the

(*) *Einleitung ins Alte Testament, von Gottfried Eichhorn.* The second enlarged and improved edition was published in 1790 at Reutlingen in three volumes. The origin and composition of the Pentateuch are discussed in vol. II. pp. 211–392.

† The full title is *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempel Archivs in ihrer Urgestalt als Beytrag zur Berichtigung der Geschichte, der Religion und Politik, aus dem Hebräischen mit kritischen und erklärender Anmerkungen, auch mancherley dazu gehörigen Abhandlungen von Karl David Ilgen, Erster Theil.* This first part, devoted exclusively to Genesis, was all that he published. The book, which is now seldom read, is a literary curiosity, and though dry, is in many respects worthy of the attention of Biblical scholars.

book, which he endeavors to establish by four proofs. First, *from misplaced titles*. He maintains, for example, that the words, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth," (Gen. ii: 4) are a *superscription*, which originally stood at the beginning of Ch. I., just as the same title, "These are the generations of Adam, of Noah," &c., wherever it is found, stands at the head of the section to which it belongs. In the first instance in which it occurs it is now out of place, and this, Ilgen thinks, can best be accounted for supposing that the compiler removed it to its present position in order to connect the first narrative of creation with the second. The other three proofs are the same as the three given by Eichhorn, only Ilgen develops them at large, and in an independent way.

What is new in Ilgen, however, is that he finds three documentary sources, not two, from which Genesis has been drawn. Astruc's only criterion for detecting the documents was the use of the divine names; Eichhorn, besides this, was guided by other broad differences which he thought he discerned between Elohist and Jehovahist; and now Ilgen scanning the Elohistic matter with a still closer scrutiny, deemed it necessary to distinguish between two classes of Elohim-sections, one of which, apart from the name Elohim, bears a near resemblance in thought and language to the Jehovah-sections, and stands in marked contrast to the other class of Elohim-sections. Hence, according to Ilgen, there were two Elohists, writing at different times, with different purposes and from different points of view; and in distinguishing between them, he pointed out many characteristic marks which later critics have acknowledged. In his minute analysis of Genesis, Ilgen thinks that he can everywhere detect, even to single clauses, what belongs to each of these three authors, and not unfrequently ascribes part of a verse to one, and part to another. All three documents, for example, enter into chap. xxx, in such a way that verse 1^a belongs to the first Elohist, and verse 1^b to v. 3 to second Elohist, and verses 14 to 16 to the Jehovahist. His analysis, however, has not been able to stand the tests applied by modern scholars, and is now almost forgotten.

For a short period after Ilgen, the criticism of the Pentateuch ran wild. It became once more simply negative; and the Documentary Hypothesis, which, while denying the unity of authorship, yet sought to trace the presence of two or more connected histories, each by a single hand, was regarded as too conservative by some scholars, and had to make way for what has been called the *Fragmentary Hypothesis*. It was the time when the Wolfian Theory of the Homeric poems was put forth; and as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were looked upon as a kind of medley composed of early songs and rhapsodies not collected together in their present form till about 500 years after Homer, so the Pentateuch was resolved into a heterogeneous mass of fragments, loosely thrown together, carelessly arranged and with no discernible order or design.

This view was favored by the assumption, shared already by Eichhorn, of numerous glosses and extended interpolations,—an assumption which tended to obscure the internal connection and to magnify the differences of style. Perhaps its earliest advocate was Fulda (died 1788) in his *Age of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament*, which appeared in 1791, a short time after his death, in Paulus' *Repertorium*, Vol. III. Fulda attributed parts of the Pentateuch to Moses, viz: certain laws, most of the songs in the last four books, and the list of stations in Num. xxxiii; but these were handed down in a fragmentary form. In the time of David a collection of laws was made, and after the Babylonian captivity, our present Pentateuch was formed by some unknown compiler who prefixed Genesis, and added historical supplements.

This theory of fragments was carried out still further by Corrodi in his *Attempt at an Inquiry into the History of the Jewish and Christian Sacred Canon*, 1792; by Otmar, whose proper name was John Christian Nachtigall, in his *Fragments on the Gradual Formation of the Holy Scriptures of the Israelites, particularly of the so-called Historical*, published in Henke's Magazine, 1794 and 1795, and by G. L. Bauer, Professor in Altorf and Heidelberg, according to whom the authors of the Penta-

teuch took three fragments from the time of Moses, viz: the list of stations, three laws (the book of the Covenant with the Decalogue, the law against Amalek, and Deuteronomy), three songs (Ex. xv.; Deut. xxxii and xxxiii, and much besides from older books, such as the "book of the Wars of the Lord." *

But it was in Vater and Hartmann that this negative side of the critical movement reached its climax. According to Vater (¶) the Pentateuch is a work of gradual formation. A few of its elements may have been derived from Moses, but they were at best only a small number of fragments, and not in their original form. In the time of David and Solomon a collection of laws was made. This was the book discovered in the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii and xxiii), which was afterwards taken up into our present book of Deuteronomy. The rest of the history and the laws was composed in fragments, at different periods, and the whole was collected and shaped as we now have it about the time of the Babylonian captivity. Similar is the view of Hartman †, who maintained that all the elements of the Pentateuch, with few exceptions, were in existence in the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but that they were not brought together in their present form till about the time of the Exile, and that the last chapters of Deuteronomy from xxviii on were added at a still later period.

There were other writers who stood in the same tendency, but it is not necessary even to name them, as this entire school of Fragmentists had but a small following, existed only for a short time, and exerted comparatively little influence on the historical development of the criticism of the Pentateuch.

Here for the present we pause, hoping that in the July number we may resume the second and more important half of the history.

* *Entwurf einer histor. krit. Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments.* First edition was published 1795, the third, 1805. (¶) *Commentar zum Pentateuch, 3 Theil, 1802-1805.*

† *Historischer-Kritische Forschungen über die Bildung, das Zeitalter und den Plan der fünf Bücher Mose's, 1831.*

ART. II.—THE ATONEMENT; OR RECONCILIATION THROUGH
THE PERFECT FULFILMENT OF THE DIVINE WILL.

BY REV. R. LEIGHTON GERHART.

EVERY complete view of the atonement involves a correct conception of the nature of sin and of the penalty of sin—death. Sin and death, however, can only be fully comprehended in the light of the atonement made by our Lord. He only, in whom the full light of life and truth shines, can give us an adequate conception of the absolute antagonism of sin and death to holiness and life; and He only, by whom sin was blotted out and death overcome, can point out the path to reunion with God. It is therefore to the words and actions of the Lord Himself that we must look for the fullest explanation of the mystery involving these subjects. To enter into an investigation of the nature of sin and death, and from them alone draw our conception of the atonement, would fill the mind with prejudice before coming to deal with Him in whom dwells all truth.

But this is not sufficient; if what our Lord taught is to be understood, we must know how to interpret His language. His words are certainly very simple, but the ideas they present are infinite; and it will never do for us to receive His words as we receive those of men. The plane on which we stand is one common to all, and our words are adequate to express our emotions, desires and thoughts, the relations in which we stand, the customs we observe, and the things with which we are familiar. We can, consequently, interpret speech by the strict laws of grammar in conformity to which it is supposed to be uttered: though, even here, sympathy

with the speaker or writer is necessary if he is to be correctly understood. But in the Scriptures we have presented to us the thoughts, the deeds, the nature, of an infinitely wise and loving being. As He immeasurably transcends earth, neither being limited to the whole or to any part of it, so His purpose and thought can never find adequate expression in the language of men. For this reason, when language is made the vehicle for the communication of Divine ideas, it always has an earthly or human meaning, which more or less conceals the sacred significance given it. It is so enveloped in the associations of this world that we are in danger of overlooking the meaning imparted to it by the Lord, and receiving it as if spoken to us by our fellow-men: and are thus led to measure the heavenly by the earthly. To-day a man of education and refinement finds it extremely difficult to communicate with a savage, because his words, though drawn from the speech of savage life and chosen with the utmost skill, carry with them the meaning which the savage has from infancy been accustomed to give them. The one, through the medium of the other's language, endeavors to convey to him a knowledge of the things and thoughts of civilized life. The other listens, and while no doubt catching a glimpse of the meaning of his instructor's words, fails to grasp it fully, because, in spite of his best efforts, these words are continually sounding to him through the medium of his own passions and low desires. This difficulty the savage can only overcome as he grows in manhood to the moral and intellectual platform of his instructor; but while he can only make this ascent gradually, he will be immensely aided by a knowledge of the true nature of the obstacle confronting him. Far greater than this is the gulf that yawns between man and God: and, as in the illustration, no absolute rule can be laid down by which to cross it; it is only the close and closer union of the believer with his Saviour which will enable him to gaze more and more clearly into the arcane of Divine revelation. When man is finally wrought to the full measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, the language of the Lord will be the language of humanity. Life will be one,

and will reveal itself in forms of speech commensurate with itself. Unity of life to-day is the basis of communion between man and man, and unity of life is the basis of communion between man and God.

There is, of course, a basis found in the language of every nation for this communion, arising from the reflection of the Divine still existing in man, though fallen. The essential nature of justice is not one thing with God and another with man, neither is faith, hope, love, or any other virtue. As there is in man a real reflection of the Divine, so there is in every relation of human life that which reflects the Divine; and this makes possible the communion of man with God. If this resemblance did not exist, if love in its innermost nature were one thing to man and another to God, if this were the case with every human conception, God would forever remain veiled from humanity, unknowable, unapproachable. Yet the ignorance and wretchedness of life so distorts and misdirects every faculty and function of man's organization, that no word used by him, however pure, can adequately express the infinite thought of the Divine. Every word subsumed by God undergoes a transformation, which withdraws it to a great extent from the comprehension of the world out of Christ, and adapts it to the higher purposes for which it is intended. "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways, higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." *Isaiah iv. 8-9.*

From no source have words and figures of speech been more frequently drawn than from our courts of justice, where the wrongs and rights of oppressor and oppressed are adjudicated. The language used to express the crudely formed principles upon which the administration of justice was based in patriarchal and primitive times, is used to illustrate the method by which the Divine sense of justice is satisfied and man liberated from the thraldom of sin. The picture that confronts us in the Scriptures of God sitting on a throne of judgment, whilst before

Him stands assembled the multitudes of the earth to receive the just reward of the deeds done in the body, is little more than a picture of a court of judgment as it was held in ancient times. That such a scene should be given us for study and reflection, is in no way to be wondered at, because, weak and imperfect as have been all attempts to administer justice in this world, it is nevertheless in such attempts that the general principles of right and wrong, reward and punishment, most clearly appear. It must necessarily be, then, from that side of human life that all words and figures are taken for the purpose of expressing the Divine thought on the subject. For this is a rule observed in the Sacred Scriptures;—every revelation made by the Lord is conveyed to us by means of words and images taken from those relations of human life which correspond most exactly with that aspect of the Divine nature to be made known. Thus, when the Lord wishes to reveal Himself as the sovereign ruler of the universe, such words as King and Lord are employed,—words indelibly associated in our minds with supreme dominion, with authority to make and execute laws, punish, defend, and similar ideas. Yet we dare not, for one moment, limit our conception of God as a sovereign to the character of any king that ever lived, or to that of all combined. The sovereignty of God so far transcends the sovereignty of every earthly potentate, that, if we bind down our conception of Him to the meaning embraced in the titles worn by them, He is at once belittled, instead of exalted. Yet God cannot speak to us on this subject otherwise than by the use of these words;—words whose meaning in ancient times was far more restricted than in our own. So, when unfolding the Divine mode of dealing with the sinner in redemption, we have the truth presented, to some extent, under the forms of an ordinary court or assize.

Governed by the prevailing political views of justice, and interpreting the words and figures of Scripture in the most literal manner, theologians have evolved a theory of redemption which makes God's method of dealing with man almost an exact reflection of an earthly court. Without taking fully into

consideration the fact that human adjudication can be only partially correct, and in many respects is and must be wholly arbitrary in its dealings, without stopping to inquire whether the received definition of justice is soundly based, they proceeded in a formal way to fashion the court of heaven after the image of that of earth. When first promulgated this view of the subject was, indeed, more satisfactory than any that had been previously advanced; and, being quite sufficient for the intellectual and spiritual needs of the day, soon gained almost universal credence. And, though theology has made wonderful progress since, this theory of redemption even yet maintains a strong hold on the minds of men. Indeed, it involves so much that is true, has been so long taught, and so widely received, that to question it is looked upon by many as equivalent to questioning some definite truth of revelation. Yet, it embraces so much that is erroneous, leads to so great a misconception of God, and is so unsatisfying to both heart and brain, that one is irresistibly impelled to search out another explanation of the work accomplished by our Lord.

The theory to which we refer is commonly known as the "Satisfaction Theory," and may be briefly stated thus:—Man transgressed the law of God; that transgression entailed a punishment which the majesty of the law required to be endured; as man was incapable of bearing it, the Son of God took the burden upon Himself, and, having propitiated the wrath of God by His own death, now offers salvation to every one who by true faith accepts Him as the Saviour of the world.

The first difficulty which lies in the way of our accepting this theory confronts us in the view it presents of the relation of sin to penalty. Penalty is not viewed as the real outflow of sin, but as a kind of arbitrary imposition, to be imposed or withheld at the option of the judge: which can be so completely disconnected from the sin that produced it as to be susceptible of imposition on the shoulders of another without at

all involving that other in the guilt of the one whose punishment he bears. This comes from the rigid way in which the human analogy has been adhered to. In civil law, penal enactments are purely arbitrary, differing in different countries and different ages. They are not moral, but physical and material; they reach the body and touch the purse, but are conditioned in no way whatever by the moral state of the criminal; they can, therefore, be altered at any time, or altogether abolished, at the will of the law-enacting power, and can be inflicted irrespective of merit on innocent and guilty alike.

This is just the reverse of the moral order;—"When lust has conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Penalty is the natural and necessary outgrowth of sin, to which it is related as effect to cause, and from which it can at no time be disjointed. This St. Paul shows in the words, "The sting of death is sin." With our civil law it is just the reverse, for there it is the penalty which embitters the sin. In the moral order the sin embitters the penalty. Death would not be death if sin were not present in it as a never-to-be-exhausted sting. It mattered not to Lucifer where he was—whether in the garden of Eden or in the sulphurous and flaming bed of hell. Lifting his majestic but sin-scarred face to heaven, he exclaims:

"Which way I turn is hell—
Myself am hell."

So, our Saviour, following out the same law of spiritual progress, says: "The Kingdom of Heaven cometh not with observation, for, lo! the Kingdom of Heaven is within you."

Transgression and punishment are organically related to each other, and can never be separated in such a way as to enable one man to bear the penalty of another's fault. While death is the punishment for sin, yet, in every stage of its progress, the effects of sin are of the nature of death, and death, the fullest culmination of the forces of sin, is itself sinful to the last degree. "To be carnally-minded," says Paul, "is death." There is in moral and spiritual things no

such sharp sundering of cause from effect as is required in order to lay the penalty of one man's wrong upon another man's back. Effects are always of the nature of the causes that produce them. Too great emphasis cannot be laid on this point, for it is only by regarding penalty as susceptible of being detached from sin that the satisfaction theory, or any kindred to it, can be maintained at all.

If the penalty of death were wholly physical,—if it began and ended with the separation of the soul from the body, the difficulty would by no means be so great. But such a definition falls far short of the meaning of the Scriptures. There, the word death is the summing up in one brief utterance of all the calamities of life. It neither begins nor ends with the dark hour when our small span of existence here is measured. Back to the source of life it runs, and out to its uttermost limits, pervaded ever by the spirit which brought it forth. It includes sickness, accident, vice, crime, insanity, despair, hate, envy, remorse, and every other evil. But these are only subordinate forms of its manifestation. The fullest exercise of its sovereignty is found in the darkening of spiritual perception, the quenching of that light which lightens every man that cometh into the world, and the full surrender of the soul to the guidance and control of evil. This is death. Disease is only one sign of it; mental perversion only a faint out-cropping of the horrid ore; but the swinish feasting on degraded things, the brutish lust for blood, the wild and disordered craving for self-gratification, with the overwhelming deluge of hate and fiendish animosity against God and all things good and true which reveals itself in the world—this opens up to us some perception of the true meaning of the word. Death is the state of the soul overwhelmed by sin.

In the Scriptures the word is used chiefly in three ways. It signifies natural death, as when our Saviour says; "Lazarus is dead;" it signifies the entire abandonment of a previous course or state of life and translation into another, as when Paul says; "Ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in

God." But when the word is used to bring before us the consequences of transgression, it signifies a darkening of all spiritual perception and a want of susceptibility to truth which renders communion with God impossible. In this sense the word is frequently employed. St. Paul speaks of the Ephesians as having been "dead in trespasses and sins." In answer to the request; "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," is the answer; "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of heaven." So, again, the Saviour says; "Whosoever believeth in me shall never die;" yet, we know that the saint as well as the sinner must suffer natural death. Again, "Whosoever believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live," and, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life," (John v. 24). Everywhere throughout the Scriptures, life is identified with the holiness which springs from faith in God, while condemnation is held up as the opposite of life. We consequently speak of the damned as living in a state of death. They, too, rise at the day of judgment, but it is to a resurrection of condemnation, which is a living death. This must be the true meaning of the word, for penalty is always of the nature of the sin which induces it. While the body and the soul constitute the man, yet, a wrong done to our physical being is always followed by consequences which are chiefly physical. On the other hand, the violation of the spiritual reveals itself most deeply in the spirit. This is fully stated in the Epistle to the Romans;—"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient, being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, malice; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, back-biters, haters of God; despiteful, proud, boasters; inventors of evil things; disobedient to parents; without understanding; covenant-breakers; without

natural affection; implacable; unmerciful; who, knowing the judgment of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

When we look upon such degeneracy as the result of sin, the deepest and darkest consequence of it, and ask ourselves; "Did Christ bear that penalty?" we feel at once how impossible it is that He could have borne it, and an examination of His life confirms this opinion. We distinctly see the sufferings of body and soul which are induced by the continual exertions of our Lord to maintain his allegiance to God. We see Him struggling to the uttermost to overcome the bigotry, ignorance and insensibility of the ruling and intellectual classes of Jews. We see Him suffering from hunger, faint from fatigue, and, at last, undergoing torture, then crucifixion, death and burial. But in all this sin can never be said to have touched any vital part of His spiritual life. There He is invulnerable. He has, therefore, no consciousness of wrong; remorse, self-contempt, estrangement from God, never even for a moment show themselves in Him. On the contrary, from the beginning to the end of His career, He walks in perfect accord with God. He does the will of His Father, and is blessed with conscious rectitude. In the midst of pain and turmoil there is always a centre of undisturbed calm. To this He bears witness in the words; "My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you." The witness of His holiness is not, however, borne only by Himself. A voice from heaven speaks; "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." And so He goes the way appointed unto the end. While He suffers, and suffers for others, not for Himself, while it can be truthfully said: "He was bruised for our iniquities," "by His stripes we are healed," and He "became a curse for us, who knew no sin," yet, that deepest, darkest aspect of death which visits every one of the sons of men is ever found wanting in His sufferings. He is a man; in many respects His lot is the common lot of men, but in all that separates man from God—

imperfection, want of goodness—He is never with them. He is from His birth immaculate. We can, therefore, see that the penalty of transgression, as commonly understood, was not borne by our Saviour, and could not have been borne by Him.

But admitting the possibility of one person suffering for the guilt of another, an examination of the nature of suffering will show us that it is altogether of a negative character. It is the consequence of an act, or a state of living which has been induced by our own conduct or that of another. It carries with it no possibilities of recovery, and is in its whole constitution endless. This is true of all effects, whether produced by physical or moral causes; once set in motion they continue on until destroyed by some force outside of themselves. A cannon ball, once sent flying through space, would continue its course forever if not brought to rest by the force of gravity or the density of the atmosphere. A word, once spoken, would sound and sound forever if some counteracting power did not come in to compel silence. As on the sea of Galilee, the power that commanded peace came not from the winds and waves, but from one who stood entirely distinct from them, so every effect is made to exhaust itself and die through the opposition and antagonism of other forces. Now this is more true of the effects, either good or bad, produced by moral causes than of any other. Every penalty is endless. It is the result of sin. It partakes of the nature of sin. In extent of duration it cannot be measured by a day or by a lifetime; and he who seeks to save himself by simple endurance will never recover.

Recovery from injury is always effected by the movement of life in a positive direction. Scarcely has the sharp edge of the hatchet penetrated the tender bark of the tree before the work of reconstruction begins, and the wound is healed by a new growth, or it is never healed. The boy who idles away his youth must bear in after years the penalty of his indolence. He may bear that calamity with heroic patience, but if his efforts end there, at the end of his life he will be as deeply involved in the consequences of his folly as at the beginning. The path of escape lies in the

diligent application of every faculty to the acquisition of knowledge, and to the use of every means of culture offered. He will be compelled to suffer for a time, but the more diligent he is the higher he will rise above the plain of suffering. At last, he will have reached such a position that he may be said to have redeemed himself. So, also, the patient endurance of the consequences entailed by evil habits, carries with it no promise of reformation. But if the enervated wretch diligently applies mind and heart to the cultivation of virtue, and all morality, he may finally reinstate himself in the position he has lost. He may become an honest, virtuous man. And when that end is attained, he may be spoken of as having redeemed himself. He will have exhausted the penalty entailed by vicious habits, by placing himself in such a position of rectitude, that the evils which before dominated over him now no longer have power even to tempt him. Here it is, that we take up the clue to the right understanding of redemption. From the state of spiritual death in which man lived, he had no strength to lift himself. The penalty was eternal. It did not consist in death for a day, or an hour,—it was death forever. On the path of simple endurance, therefore, it never could have been exhausted either by himself or by another, even though that other were divine and human. To struggle with evil for a lifetime, to lie in the tomb three days, would not atone for sin any more than entering the prison at one door and going out at another would atone for the crime of larceny or any other criminal act. Had our Lord attempted to assume the burden of spiritual death, He would have been forever dead; there could have been no redemption. On the same principle on which a vicious, or intemperate, or diseased man is freed from his evil, our Lord moves in His efforts to save the race.

Spiritual disorganization began in disobedience; the atonement begins in obedience. "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." As disobedience entailed moral darkness, and physical ruin, obedience re-establishes the soul in right

relation to God, and gives it spiritual light and health. Where the disease begins, there also must begin the cure; on the same line on which the injury is wrought, the remedy must be applied. And the consequence of sin is finally exhausted by the elevation of the sufferer to a state of holiness in which he is neither the servant of sin, nor even susceptible to temptation from it. For the true strength of sin is found in our own infirmity. To a pure and noble minded man there is nothing but disgust in the odor of the rum-shop; to an inebriate there is such temptation in the fumes of the foul place that resistance, if made at all, can only be made at the cost of intense suffering.

Christ assumed our nature at the incipient stages of growth, and in that assumption purified it of all corruption. He advanced, growing in favor with God and man, by the positive discharge of the Divine will. Thus, He elevated humanity above evil, and brought it more and more into full accord with God. Viewed in this light, every act of Christ is one of atonement, a bringing into absolute accord of the human and the Divine. His death on the cross stands out with startling prominence, but while in that event the labors of our Lord's life on earth culminate, yet the crucifixion moves on the same plane occupied by the less significant acts of His life. He was not born merely to die, but His birth or incarnation was itself an act of atonement. In it, the opening stage of human existence, the humanity which is fully redeemed in his glorification, is absolutely purified and united to God; and, so far as conception and infancy go, the atonement is complete. But infancy is only the bud of human existence; beyond it lies youth and manhood; beyond fully developed manhood is death, or the transition into the celestial world; beyond that, the unfolding of all the possibilities involved in the idea of man's creation, actualized only in the heaven of heavens, where God dwells in a radiance of glory unequalled, far less surpassed, by that which enshrines His presence in the church. When, through this progress, the human will is finally brought to such a state that, in its lowest and highest activity, it is the expres-

sion of the Divine will; when the human knows no false independence, and when the consequences of that independence, ignorance, pride, lust, with the countless host of subordinate evils into which these three ramify, are forever ended; when the Divine shines through the human a conscious presence, illuminating it with light, joy, and peace,—then that atonement is complete. The Father's love then rests unchecked, unhampered, full, and free in the child; no barrier to thought, to action, exists, nor can exist; temptation no longer raises its head, and sorrow, sin, and death are forever laid in the dust.

Redemption presents itself to us as a different aspect of the same subject. The two advance side by side, each being completed as the other progresses. Redemption, however, is dependent upon the atonement, and in it forever stands. While the latter is the union of man and God, the former is the elevation of the human above all the sin and sorrow inherent in the life of this world, and the establishment of man in an attitude of positive holiness. The human is not simply reinstated in its former relation to God, for that would be only a partial redemption, so long as this world remains involved in evil, a whole creation groaning and travailing in iniquity. Nor could it be merely a lifting of the human above the evils of infancy or manhood, but above all the evils and difficulties environing it, or awaiting it, in its progress to the highest point of its development, the very presence of God, it is carried. Whatever man was to be, that in Christ he is. Whatever capacities for knowledge, activity, or enjoyment he was endowed with are, in that redemption, brought into full, free play. He is made free. And freedom not only implies liberation from servitude induced by spiritual degeneracy, but liberation also from the thrall of incomplete development. The infant is in thrall to his infancy, and the young man to his youth; he rises in freedom as he rises to upright, mature manhood, for entire freedom is only attained when all possible perfection is reached. And to such heights of freedom God, in uniting humanity to Himself, has carried it. Man is redeemed.

Our Saviour emphasizes the necessity of His own suffering; but He lays far greater stress on the discharge of His Father's will as carrying with it, not only for Himself but also for others, the assurance of unity with God. Beginning with the first of His recorded utterances; "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business," we have the emphasis laid on this truth through the whole of His life. Thus He points to His mission in life; "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me":—to the source of His strength; "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work":—to the habitual state of His life; "I do always those things that please Him":—to his resignation; "Thy will not mine be done." It is remarkable, too, how unity with the Father depends on this obedience; "And he that sent me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him." The copulative brings out that relation, and as here, so in innumerable passages. Thus, He proceeds until at length we have the declaration: "I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth:" which confronts us with the same process of spiritual progress made known in the words: "He grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

The whole life of our Saviour is an illustration of this general thought. He advances not only from infancy to manhood, but from a state in which the Divine power confided to Him appears in the bud, to that in which it appears in full bloom. As he advances His teachings take a higher and higher range. His miracles are more startling and His claims to unity with the Father, and of consequent endowment with supernatural strength, more frequent and far-reaching. There are other signs of this progress: at His baptism the Holy Spirit descends in the form of a dove and alights upon Him; later on, He is transfigured on Mt. Hermon. At length, He tells the disciples that the work of His life is finished, and His glorification near at hand. We see Him after His resurrection in a state transcending earth, yet not in one which completely frees Him from

it. He has not yet ascended to His Father. At last comes the ascension; but, as if that was a spiritual process which required time, it is not until ten days after the disciples have seen Him disappear before their eyes, that the Spirit is poured out. The progress in our Lord's life is entirely too marked to admit of question.

In the Epistles this aspect of our Lord's life, while not so pronounced, is, nevertheless, brought prominently forward. There is more emphasis laid here on the fact that Christ suffered for us. The reason for this can be readily found in that "dread of something after death," as a punishment for transgression, which rested like an incubus on the hearts of men. The fear of punishment was the first and most prominent thought. That Christ had freed us from this punishment, that by His sufferings He had opened to man the path to forgiveness, was, consequently, then, as now, the first point dwelt upon in calling men to repentance. The philosophy of redemption was held in the back-ground, as of far less importance than the grand fact of redemption through His blood. But when the Epistles are examined more closely, an underlying tone of thought is discovered which gives the sufferings of our Lord a far different position, relative to the great work of His life, from that which is commonly assigned to them.

The key-note of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans is justification through faith in Jesus Christ, in opposition to any hope of righteousness to be attained by "works of the law." But how is our Lord represented as becoming the author of salvation? As Adam fell by transgressing the will of God, so, moving on the same plane, Christ saves by fulfilling the will of God. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came on all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. v. 18-19. By this obedience "Christ *became* the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. x. 4. He

was made perfect in righteousness, and thus became the end or fulfilment of the law—thus the author of salvation. So in the Epistle to the Hebrews, we have the same thought; “Though He were a son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” Heb. v. 8-9. Here we have, as before, the emphasis laid on the positive side. It is that which gives all suffering its value; the suffering is nothing without it.

But a more striking confirmation of this thought is found further on:—“Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O, God. Above, when he said sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law: Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O, God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” Heb. x. 5-10. *By the which will we are sanctified—through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*

Turning to the Old Testament we there find the same thought, under one form or another, everywhere. Thus, in the fifteenth psalm, in answer to the questions: “Who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill?” we have the answer: “He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. *He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbor, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor.* In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoreth them that fear the Lord. *He that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not. He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh a reward against the innocent.* He that doeth these *things* shall never be moved.” So, again, in Psalm xxiv. 3 5, “Who shall ascend into the hill of

the Lord? or, who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart, who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation." Still more clearly is this thought unfolded in the whole of the penitential psalm of David, particularly at the close: "O, Lord, open thou my lips; and my mouth shall show forth thy praise. For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O, God, thou wilt not despise. Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering, and whole burnt offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar." The whole reaches its climax in Psalm xl. 6-8, which we have already quoted.

Through the whole of the prophetic utterances obedience is always pointed out as the way to give meaning to the ceremonies and sacrifices of the law. At times, it is so strongly emphasized as almost to deprive the symbolism of the Jewish worship of all importance. As, for instance, when Isaiah breaks forth: "Hear the word of the Lord ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers I will not hear; your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away

the evil of your doings from before mine eyes ; cease to do evil ; learn to do well ; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."—Isaiah i. 10-17. The whole character of a ceremony, its true validity, is entirely destroyed when that of which it is the expression is wanting. It is a body without a soul, a dark deserted house from which thought and life have fled away. "Therefore, says the Lord, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee ; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way ; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."—Matt. v. 23-24. What gift of gold, or anything else, can be acceptable to God when that which the gold symbolizes, surrender of the soul to Him, is denied by hatred ? And so, again, in the Saviour's denunciation of the Pharisees : "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also."—Matt. xxiii. 25-26. All is foul so long as the heart is not right in God's sight ; even His own ordinances are broken and disfigured, are rendered useless when they are made to express in an outward form that which has no existence in the inner life. Looking upon this as the underlying thought of the Old Testament, we can understand what Christ meant when He said, "I came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil." Generically that law is fulfilled by love, "for love is the fulfilling of the Law."

Obedience to God rendered by a person whose passions and inclinations tend with tremendous force to the gratification of self, necessarily involves a conflict of the greatest intensity ; and if this obedience is rendered in opposition to the prevailing customs, modes of thought, and passions of men, it will become a conflict, not only of that person against his own evil inclinations, but also against the world ; which, excited by his example and reproof, will gradually rouse all its energies in bit-

ter antagonism and persecution. Now, while our Saviour was sinless, and cannot therefore be spoken of as having been tormented by evil passions and inclinations such as rule men in general, yet His humanity being identical with our own, He was susceptible to temptation as it approached Him from without;—so susceptible, that the maintenance of His rectoral honor involved a struggle of such intensity that at times He appeared almost exhausted by it. Indeed, the full depths of Christ's sufferings we do not know; but if the trial was at all proportioned to the strength of the man, it was unfathomable. It descended in depth until all possibility of temptation was exhausted; that it must have done, or there would still have been a point beyond which a positive adhesion to right over against wrong had not been maintained.

Many an one will do you an act of kindness even at the risk of his life, who will bear no dishonor for your sake. Benedict Arnold could bear the title of rebel, could jeopardize his head for the sake of his country; but enmity and rivalry found him out; there he was weak, and fell. A mother will endure an amount of pain and anguish for her child which is amazing, but the ravening hunger of famine found out the Jewish mother, and her child is devoured. There are certain forms of temptation which the mass of men are capable of resisting, but a weakness is sure to be detected in some particular element of every character, and when the conditions are present for the excitement of this element, the man falls; no one ever endured to the uttermost save Christ. Temptation did not content itself with a single appeal, but as circumstances favored the attack new forms of evil assaulted him; his whole soul, we can well believe, was laid bare by temptation. Whatever there was in Christ which had not affirmed itself positively on God's side in opposition to evil, was tried in Gethsemane and on the cross. There sin fell powerless; it could do nothing; He was made perfect in Holiness; His susceptibility to temptation was all exhausted, and He consequently stood beyond its reach.

There is probably no form of pain which is more excru-

ciating than that which arises from sympathy; and from it our Lord must have suffered intensely. Whatever be the pangs of remorse, whatever the overwhelming sense of degradation, whatever the fires of hate, it may well be questioned whether they equal in consuming power the suffering experienced by one who sees the husband, parent, or child going down step by step to irrecoverable ruin and shame; or, who beholds one dearer than life overtaken by some terrible calamity, from which there is little or no hope of escape. The world bears witness, in countless instances, of the madness, the melancholy and despair, which in such circumstances has quenched the light and joy of existence in many hearts. The gray-haired old king, in an outbreak of pathetic lamentation, which no poetry can surpass, proclaims the greatness of the calamity that struck him in the death of his traitorous but beautiful boy, Absalom. Cordelia's grief divides our sympathy with Lear, while the anguish of Margaret at the thought of her slain boy, goes far to awaken respect in us for that ambitious and wicked Queen. Nor is there any limit to the sacrifices such love will make. Moses will have his name blotted out of the book of life rather than see his people destroyed; while Paul could wish himself accursed for the sake of his brethren, the children of Israel. Far off reflection, all these, of that love which would not only, but did become accursed, so far as it was possible, for the sake of those who crucified Him.

But between the pain arising from sympathizing love, and the pain of guilt, there lies a gulf which cannot be crossed. Such love would be the best safe-guard against the anguish of hell, would indeed carry heaven into the very region of the damned: for it bears with it the blessing of an approving conscience, and of an approving God. That our Saviour thus suffered, we know full well; but the depth of that anguish can only be measured by the infinitude of the love which illumined His whole life. The capacity for suffering increases in proportion to the increase of the delicacy and perfection of spiritual organization; so He who was a perfect man cannot be measured

in His joys or griefs by those who in every respect are incomparable with Him.

In this suffering lay the sacrifice;—a sacrifice acceptable to God, not because sin was counter-balanced by a definite quantity of pain, but because the pain was an evidence of the strength of Christ's love. The pain itself gives no pleasure; it is the love that propitiates. And this love is demanded because God is love, and there can be no blissful union with Him where it is wanting. It had to be developed in antagonism to evil, because man had involved himself in evil, and because the world was a world of evil. Could it have been possible to save our race and yet escape all anguish, we cannot for one moment believe that the mere satisfaction of an abstract idea of justice, would have required our Lord to pass through the agony of death. But this was not possible. The constitution of the being of God, and the constitution of man, who is made in the Image of God, forbade it. For it is not through a formal command of Jehovah that man is expelled from His presence; nor through a formal expression of satisfaction, that he is restored to favor. Estrangement comes through the violation of that holiness which is one with the very being of the Lord: and it is through the fulfilment of all righteousness that man is restored to God. "Be ye holy for I am holy," admits of no suppression.

It is not possible to conceive of God living in harmony with the creature formed by His own hands, after that creature has forsaken the path of love and holiness. Even amongst men, between one who is all purity, and another who is all corruption fellowship can never be real. See King Arthur bending over the prostrate form of Guinevere "in the holy house at Almesbury," and hear him as he says:—

"O golden hair, with which, I used to play
Not knowing! O imperial moulded form,
And beauty such as never woman wore,
Until it came a kingdom's curse with thee—
I cannot touch thy lips, they are not mine,

But Lancelot's: nay, they never were the king's
I cannot take thy hand; that too is flesh,
And in the flesh thou hast sinned; and mine own flesh
Here looking down on thine polluted, cries
'I loathe thee,' yet not less, O Guinevere,
For I was ever virgin save for thee,
My love thro' flesh hath wrought into my life
So far, that my doom is, I love thee still.
Perchance, and so thou purify thy soul,
And so thou lean on our fair father Christ,
Hereafter in that world where all are pure,
We two may meet before high God, and thou
Wilt spring to me, and claim me thine, and know
I am thine husband."—

What is it here that can propitiate? What is it that is propitiating? Is it the suffering or the repentance? The pain or the progress in virtue and nobility? In what sense can the suffering be spoken of as acceptable and pleasing. Only as an evidence of the undying love animating the fallen queen's heart to free herself from the taint of corruption, and be united once more in all purity to her husband. So with man and his Creator.

But the satisfaction theory views the subject in quite a different light. From beginning to end it emphasizes not the positive but the negative side of the atonement. The satisfaction rendered to God consists in appeasing His anger, not in fulfilling the demands of His love. Yet from the beginning to the end of our Lord's life, He moves forward on the line indicated in the words: "God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." And this line of progress is in full accordance with the deepest principles of political and moral justice.

It is very common, we know, to regard justice as being primarily vindictory: and this opinion is carried to such an extent as often to exclude every other meaning from the word. When the criminal has endured his penalty, it is said, justice is satisfied. Yet, neither in the eye of the civil or

moral law is wrong thus expiated. In truth, emphasis is here laid on one element only of expiation, and not that which is primary but secondary. Both civil and moral law move primarily on the line of restitution. The very law that excludes is in its intention preservative. The penalty of the offender is always held subordinate to the restoration of the sufferer to the rights of which he has been deprived: and when the penalty is inflicted, it is grounded entirely upon principles of preservation and correction: it is never inflicted merely for the sake of satisfying an abstract idea of justice: and Blackstone has been severely criticised for not making such a general idea the foundation of his system. In practice, justice is often limited to the infliction of penalty, because the crime is often so purely moral in its effects that no restitution can be offered.

Together with the intention of teaching men the sacredness of the person and property of every individual, and thus leading to the full recognition of the command: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," this was the whole scope of Mosaic legislation. It is primarily restitutional. It is value for value, a slave for a slave, an ox for an ox, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. And just as we find this principle recognized in the written law of the land, so do we find it in the unwritten law of the heart. No sooner is Zaccheus converted than he exclaims:—"The half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold." The Conscience Fund is a standing witness to this same truth. Not until restitution is made to the full extent of the criminal's ability, no matter how great his sufferings, does he feel that he has answered the claims of justice. So, in all instances of remorse for crime, the bitterness springs, to a great extent, from the inability to undo that which has been done. Pain would be counted as nothing, if that could be accomplished. But restitution often cannot be made, and on that fact the remorseful heart rests as on a thorn.

Again: when punishment is inflicted, it is always qualified by considerations of condition and circumstance. It is not suffi-

cient for us to know simply that one man has been slain by another, we must know also whether the act was premeditated, or accidental, whether committed by a sane or an insane man. If premeditated, we must know the degree of aggravation; if accidental, the extent of culpable negligence. These and many other circumstances, the court must be cognizant of before the slayer can be convicted of murder. So with every violation of the civil law. So also with every violation of the Divine law. Those who have sinned in ignorance shall be beaten with few stripes, while those who have sinned deliberately, with many stripes. The laborer who, because no man had hired him, stood all the day idle, in the end, receives a reward equal to that given to those who had borne the burden and heat of the day. While on the cross, the Saviour prayed; "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." Thus making the very ignorance of His murderers the ground of their forgiveness. In the primal sin we find a clear distinction made in the degree of culpability incurred by the serpent, the woman, and the man. "On thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life," is spoken to the first. "I will greatly multiply thy sorrows, and thy conception: in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children: and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," is spoken to the woman. To the man;—"cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." Punitive justice is governed in its utterance, not by the ultimate result to which the crime that induced it may lead, but by the degree in which the law by that one act has been violated. The man who strikes his neighbor can be prosecuted, but though he has yielded to a spirit which if followed will assuredly bring him to the gallows, yet to hang him for that crime would be a crime itself. Though the sin of Adam was the beginning of a course of action which, if persevered in, would end in total destruction, yet God does not overwhelm him with the extreme penalties of the law, but visits upon him a punishment commensurate with the guilt incurred by that particular act. Adam is not a reprobate after his fall. He is

left, not only with susceptibilities for instruction and correction, but with strong and never-dying aspirations after complete restoration. The will is broken, but not utterly powerless. And we soon see evidences of this in the lives of Cain and Abel, and still more clearly in that of Enoch, who for his holiness was translated.

All this the satisfaction theory entirely ignores. It regards the first transgression as involving man at once in the extremest penalties of the law. Notwithstanding the evidence shown by Adam of a strong love and reverence for God, it regards him as utterly beyond all hope, and meriting nothing but hell with all its horrors. This conclusion is the natural outflow of the mechanical way in which the whole subject is viewed.

While thus tempering punishment to the degree of guilt incurred, God meets every effort on the part of man for restoration with assistance. He does not abandon him to a hopeless state of crippled existence, or because he is crippled strike him a blow that renders him still more decrepid; but as he raises himself God always stoops to aid. The father even runs to meet the prodigal. Aye, it is even as the poet has said:—

“As men from men
Do, in the constitution of their souls,
Differ, by mystery not to be explained;
And as we fall by various ways, and sink
One deeper than another, self-condemned,
Through manifold degrees of guilt and shame,
So manifold and various are the ways
Of restoration, fashioned to the steps
Of all infirmity, and tending all
To the same point,—attainable by all;
Peace in ourselves, and union with our God.”

The first act related of Jehovah after Adam and Eve discover their nakedness, is that He provided them with clothing. They are not abandoned to perish. That itself would have been a wrong. For criminals have rights. And it is the general recognition of the rights of criminals, and of the great wrong done them when they are inclosed in prisons where they are ex-

posed to debasing and hardening influences, which is one of the secret causes stirring our prison associations to put forth efforts for their relief and enlightenment. It is felt that in inflicting the penalties of the law upon them, more is involved in the infliction than justice requires; and just as soon as that is done, the judges themselves become criminals.

"*Portia.* Soft:

The Jew shall have all justice;—soft!—no haste;—
He shall have nothing but the penalty.

Gratiano. O Jew! an upright judge, a learned judge.

Por. Therefore, prepare thee to cut off the flesh,
Shed thou no blood; nor cut thou less, nor more,
But just a pound of flesh: if thou takest more,
Or less, than just a pound,—be it so much
As makes it light, or heavy, in the substance,
Or the division of the twentieth part
Of one poor scruple; nay, if the scale do turn
But in the estimation of a hair,—
Thou diest, and all thy goods are confiscate."

The principle here involved is as true now as is the old days of Venetian supremacy, when the event above referred to is supposed to have taken place. Human life and human rights are precious. And no where is this preciousness so fully brought to light as in God's dealings with man. "A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench until he send forth judgment unto victory." And this course of action is not one of mere groundless mercy; it is based upon the eternal law of right, which is the very back-bone of justice, and governs every act of God.

From the beginning to the end of the long and torturous Jewish history, nothing is more wonderful than the continuous giving of spiritual and material assistance to the chosen people. There was balm in Gilead in the old days of the Jewish monarchy, even as there was balm in Gilead for the bruised and broken heart, when the poor woman knelt at the feet of Christ, bathed His feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. The whole spirit of Old Testament dispensation gathers itself

up in the injunction: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me;" and in the answer: "I waited patiently for the Lord; and he inclined unto me and heard my cry. He brought me up, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings. And he hath put a new song into my mouth, even praise unto our God."

It may appear to some as if we were confounding mercy with justice. And this is true if we carry in our minds the idea that mercy is an element of love distinct from justice, and acting only in a kind of antagonism to it. But it is not so; on the contrary, mercy is an essential element of justice, and where it is wanting we cannot have the right administration of law. Mercy takes into consideration the palliating circumstances involved in the commission of crime. It is that qualifying element which, guiding men in their efforts to give the criminal his just deserts, refuses to regard the simple violation of law as necessarily involving the highest degree of guilt. It comes into play in the effort to adapt a general law to the special requirements of a particular case. And whenever it is exercised in our civil courts or social circles, we always find that mercy is based upon those conditions of circumstance and accident, governing the commission of a crime, which, if unregarded, transform justice into injustice. Where there are no grounds of this character for mercy to rest upon, it cannot be exercised without involving its own destruction. And we, consequently, find that there is a state to which a man may fall in the divine government of the world in which no mercy can be extended to him. "Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith they may blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

Many persons rest under the supposition that the prevailing views of justice are so rounded and complete that they are not susceptible to any improvement. Justice is progressive, and keeps pace with the world's growth in the consciousness of right and wrong. The leaven of Christianity is pervading it more

and more with the elements of tenderness and mercy. It is becoming each day more corrective, and less vindictive and revengeful. The justice of a hundred years ago would, if practised now, shock every sensibility of the heart; and if the advance continues on the same plane on which it is now going, there will be a complete revolution of the common views of the subject. Yet, in approaching the study of Redemption, there is a strong tendency to view it entirely from the standpoint of justice, which human wisdom has given us, and that, too, the wisdom of three hundred years ago. We need enlightenment on the subject of justice as on all others; and the source of light is Divine Revelation. Approaching it, we see that justice always moves forward on the line of restitution. For there are two parties involved in the commission of every crime,—the one who has sinned, and the one who has been sinned against: and so long as the sufferer is not reinstated in his rights, justice is never satisfied. What satisfaction is there to a father when his daughter has been led astray by some villain to see that villain fined or imprisoned? Not until the child is restored to the father's arms as pure and undefiled as when she fled from them, is atonement made for that wrong; until that is done the red and gaping wounds of his heart cry out for redress.

The whole movement of redemption is heavenward—to the satisfaction of the love of God, which in the fall of Adam was grievously wronged. Every act, therefore, of justice, mercy, forgiveness, proceeds from this standpoint. Punishment is merely the negative element, both in the fall and in the recovery of man. Man must be led back to his father, pure, sinless, free from all contamination. When that is accomplished, the wrong has been righted, the wound has been healed, for only then is the inexorable law of love satisfied. Reconciliation, therefore, is not made by descending into hell, but by ascending into heaven. The first may be in order of time, but the second is in order of importance; neither is it the first which makes the second possible; it is the ascending principle which gives all importance to the sacrifice. The atonement is not made on the cross but in heaven; the death of Christ is one advanced stage

of it; the resurrection is a higher one; in the ascension it is still farther advanced; in the glorification at God's right hand it is completed.

The chief difficulty to be contended with in studying this and every other subject, lies in the fact that truth is never presented to us in its unity, but always in its diversity;—in a diversity in which the individual elements (that in the workings of Providence are never active single and alone but always in harmony with their co-ordinates), appear in an independent and antagonistic way. The diversity of these various elements we clearly see, but fail invariably in the synthetic process. The light which shines from heaven is pure and white, but separate its rays and you have all the colors of the rainbow. What point of union is there between red and blue and yellow? By an ingenious mechanical contrivance they can be again blended, but can the wise man answer how? We speak of justice, of wisdom, and of love. We analyze the one and the other, in such a way as to receive the impression that each has an independent existence of its own. Whereas, in truth, neither is itself without the others. Love without wisdom is blind love, and just in that degree lacks some part of itself. Love without justice is weak love, and just in that degree lacks some part of itself. Love in its full might is both just and wise; it must rise to the summit of wisdom, and embrace all the fortitude of justice, or cease to be itself; so of wisdom; so of justice. Justice which is not the expression of the highest wisdom is tyranny, and wisdom which is not the very utterance of justice is a lie. Justice without love becomes wrong. Wisdom without love is folly. Justice becomes apparent in the conflict of right and wrong. Sin draws it into the foreground, yet it always existed and always will. It is one form in which God's love revealed itself in dealing with sinful man. It is the one form in which love was compelled to be active predominantly in order that the ends of love might be reached. In justice satisfied God's love folds its wings and rests; the end is reached; God is all in all.

ART. III.—WAS THE MESSIAH TO BE DIVINE ?

BY REV. DANIEL VAN PEELT, A. M.

CANON WORDSWORTH, in the article "Son of God," (Smith's Bible Dictionary,) puts the question, "Whether the Jews, in our Lord's age, generally believed that the Messiah, or Christ, was also the Son of God in the highest sense of the term, namely: as a Divine Person, coequal, coeternal, and consubstantial with the Father?"

A little further on he adds: "The question is not whether the Jews *might not and ought not* to have inferred the Divine Sonship of the Messiah from their own Scriptures, but whether, for the most part, they *really did* deduce that doctrine from those Scriptures?"

Dr. Wordsworth himself answers this question, thus carefully defined, in the negative; and in support of that position adduces what he calls "external evidence derived from the testimony of ancient writers who lived near to our Lord's age."

The first witness cited is "Trypho, the leading Jew, who debated with Justin Martyr at Ephesus about A. D. 150, on the points of controversy between the Jews and Christians." He is quoted as saying during the course of this debate: "That it seems to him not only paradoxical, but silly, to say that the Messiah, or Christ, pre-existed from eternity as God, and that He condescended to be born as man." Again, "All we (Jews) expect that the Messiah will come as *a man from man* (i. e. from human parents), and that Elias will anoint Him when He is come."

The great Christian Father, Origen, who wrote in defence of

Christianity against its assailant Celsus, is next quoted: "No Jew would allow that any prophet ever said that a Son of God would come; but what the Jews do say is, that the Christ of God will come; and they often dispute with us Christians as to this very question, for instance, concerning the Son of God, on the plea that no such person exists or was ever foretold."

Canon Wordsworth bases his opinion on two additional testimonies: "In the 4th century," he writes, "Eusebius testified that the Jews of that age would *not* accept the title Son of God as applicable to the Messiah; and in later days they charge Christians with impiety and blasphemy for designating Christ by that title." And "lastly, a learned Jew, Orobio, in the 17th century, in his conference with Limborch, affirms that if a prophet, or even if it were possible, the Messiah himself, were to work miracles, and yet lay claim to *divinity*, he ought to be put to death by stoning, as one guilty of blasphemy."

This certainly is unmistakable testimony. It opens to our view a very decided state of opinion in regard to the Messiah. It seems to indicate most clearly that to the Jews generally the Divinity of the Messiah was and is a conception farthest from their minds; that the claim of Divinity by Jesus seems to them a horrible blasphemy, making it impossible for them, for this reason alone, to accept Him as the fulfilment of Messianic Prophecy.

These remarkable citations are of interest for more than one reason. They seem to throw a ray of additional light upon the Gospel history. These testimonials, indeed, have been taken from men who lived one, two, three, and even sixteen hundred years after Christ. When did this horror at the idea of Messiah's divinity arise, then? Was it not the result, perhaps, of disappointment and despondency, because Jerusalem was no more? We are compelled to think that the forcible declaration of the Jew Orobio must hold true of the Jews of Christ's day; since, read in the light of that assertion, there is afforded an explanation of several important circumstances in Jesus' history, not otherwise so clear. At Cesarea Philippi

Jesus asked His disciples the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" After their report of what men said, placing Him on no higher level than that of an Elijah, John the Baptist, or one of the prophets, He put the personal inquiry, "But whom say ye that I am?" Then Peter said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!" "And he straitly charged them, and commanded them to tell no man that thing." Now why must they hide that thing? Why not let the people know all about Him? We can easily understand the reason, if in the opinion of His age Divinity was so far from being attached to the conceptions of the Messiah, that the claim of Divinity even by the Messiah Himself, would compel them to execute the sentence against blasphemy upon Him. For then the general proclamation of the truth contained in Peter's words would have been Jesus' immediate death-warrant. Again, why did Jesus charge the three disciples who witnessed the Transfiguration not to tell of it till after His death? It seems to us for the same reason as in the case just mentioned. What was the Transfiguration? It was a momentary, *visible* revelation to these disciples, of our Lord's Divinity, that it might be ineradicably impressed upon their conviction. So Peter writes about it long afterwards; and thus John could affirm that he had seen with his eyes that which was eternal in Christ; "that which was from the beginning" "of the word of life." The promiscuous circulation of such a conviction among His disciples, based upon a claim made by Himself, would have been prematurely fatal, if indeed the Jews held the opinion about the Divinity we have supposed; and if there was *not* this danger about it we do not clearly understand why the disciples were forbidden to tell of so glorious and glad an experience. Once more, in this circumstance seems to lie a very satisfactory explanation of that strange phenomenon, the testimony to Christ's Divinity by persons possessed of devils. It seems unaccountable that these devils should so readily and officiously announce Him to be the Son of the Highest. Why should they assist Him so effec-

tively? and why should Jesus rebuke them for it, and hasten to cast them out when thus they spake? But suppose it was death to any one to be thus addressed; suppose that the exalted Being who was to realize in Himself the amazing prophecies concerning the Messiah, was so little thought to be Divine, that this single claim would hurl even *him* to a felon's degradation and death;—and we can appreciate the true Satanic malignity of these devils in hailing Jesus by those awful words. No wonder that with the utmost sternness of rebuke Jesus commanded them to be still and to come forth. And lastly, in this we think we recognize the significance of His spontaneous and unanimous condemnation to death, when Jesus stood at last before the Sanhedrin. This point is argued at length by Canon Wordsworth himself, maintaining that “the reason of his condemnation by the Jewish Sanhedrin, and of his delivery to Pilate for crucifixion, was not that He claimed to be the Messiah or Christ, but because He asserted Himself to be *much more* than that; in a word, because He claimed to be the *Son of God*, and to be *God*. The Sanhedrin was unanimous in the sentence of condemnation. This is remarkable. We cannot suppose that there were not some conscientious persons in so numerous a body. Indeed, it may readily be allowed that many . . . were guided by a desire to comply with God's law, which required them to put to death every one who was guilty of blasphemy.”

But the fact so strikingly evidenced by Dr. Wordsworth's citations may serve a more sinister purpose. It may place a weapon in the hands of those who refuse to ascribe divinity to our Lord. It may give countenance to an assertion something like this: the deifying of Jesus was the fond fabrication of subsequent ages, not at all in accord with the spirit of the ancient Scriptures, which constitute the revealed truth of God; for such an idea was not recognized or discovered by the original possessors of these Scriptures. Indeed, when actually broached, it was indignantly repudiated by all the Jews through all generations down to the present time. This, therefore,

amounts to important and weighty presumptive proof against the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

If such a use as this can be made of these citations, it behooves us to look them clearly in the face, and consider frankly whether they have any force in this direction. There seems demanded of us a fair and thorough investigation of all the facts in the case to see who are justified in their opinion of the Messiah, the Jews or we. Whether in the face of Jewish interpretations (and that of their own peculiar Scriptures), utterly hostile to our view, we can still maintain that the Messiah of the Jewish Scriptures *was to be* Divine; and, therefore, that Jesus Christ *was* Divine, truly the Son of God in the flesh? Our main position to be established, therefore, may be put somewhat as follows:

I. The Messianic Idea, as actually gathered from the Old Testament Scriptures, includes the Messiah's Divinity.

We come then face to face with the task of examining the Scriptures of the Jews, to see if they were justified in banishing so utterly from their conceptions of the Messiah, the idea of His Divinity. Tracing that Messianic Idea from its earliest to its latest development, is it impossible for us, as it seems to them, to discover this Divinity? or can we by any fair interpretation at all, reach clearly and unmistakably this most supreme conception? These are the questions to be determined throughout our subsequent inquiry.

And first of all we inquire, what *is* the Messianic Idea of the Old Testament? What is embraced in it, what are the features of its development? "Messianic prophecy," says Van Oosterzee, "is the continuation of a golden string of promises, with which the Pentateuch had already made the prophets and their contemporaries acquainted. The house of David, himself a prophet rejoicing in the loftiest prospect of the future, becomes the point around which gather the fairest expectations, shadowed forth in ever clearer outline. In the earlier prophets . . . these are expressed in more general forms; but . . . in Isaiah, the ardently desired offspring of David is depicted in ever live-

lier colors. . . . Jeremiah sees the throne of David arising in glorious brightness, and sets forth at the same time all the spiritual glory which the new dispensation has above the old . . . Zechariah sees the priestly and kingly office united in the offspring of David who comes in meekness to the wretched. Malachi . . . proclaims the second Elias as his forerunner. Each prophet towers above his predecessor; all together point to the One who is the end or final aim of Law and Prophecy." (Theol. of N. T., v. 4.)

This brief but eloquent survey describes the rise and development of the Messianic Idea proper: of that idea as it derived clearness and definiteness from being woven among the associations and hopes fondly clinging about the person and throne of David. *He* was the anointed one; so the "Messiah" receives this name as *par excellence*. *He* was the king, and Messiah was to be his Son, and therefore occupy His throne and rule as king. But when we say that this is the Messianic Idea *proper*, we wish to call attention to an important distinction. While this name and these associations,—conveyed always by means of material representations, but often clearly understood in a spiritual sense,—begin to take hold of the people's imagination and faith in the reign of David, and receive subsequently a development ever more distinct as the ages progress, and as prophet succeeds prophet; still the Idea *itself*, in its essential nature, had an earlier existence than this. To this period the Messianic Idea was first indebted, so to speak, for a "local habitation and a name." But it had a history long before that; it had lived in the minds and hearts of the faithful from the very beginning. As we turn to this earlier history, we shall discover the as yet nameless Idea, existing as an intensely real and potent Conviction or Hope.

The true and *essentially* Messianic Idea, then, had its birth in the Garden of Eden. It sprang into existence on the same day that was uttered the Great Promise of Redemption; for the Promise of Redemption created at once the Thought of the Redeemer. True, it was vague; but even then it centered in a

Person. The significant contrast in the names of her first and second sons, seems to indicate a fond hope in the heart of Eve that her first-born might be *the appointed Seed*. At any rate, the mention of the "Seed of the Woman" bade men look for some one bearing their own nature, a man from among men, a *Son of Man*, to accomplish the bruising of Satan's head. As the line of the godly continues, both before and after the Flood, the eye of faith is ever fixed upon that glorious Offspring. At last Abraham appears, and with him the promise concerning the Coming Seed assumes a greater definiteness. Out of all that now constituted the seed of woman, *his*, Abraham's seed, was to accomplish the universal blessing. Faith was hereby not directed to another object; it was but pointed to a more particular direction where it must look for its appearance eventually. Thus this Hope or Idea lived in the hearts of the faithful until Jacob's dying words again narrowed the scope of its possible realization. It was from amid the one tribe, Judah, of all Abraham's chosen seed, that Shiloh, the restorer of Peace, should come. If into the conceptions of the Messiah enter preëminently those of a Saviour and a Prince of Peace, then even as early as the patriarchal age we perceive distinctly the elements of the Messianic Idea: Redemption, by bruising the serpent's head; the Sceptre Judah's, because from him Shiloh was to come; and the name Shiloh, meaning Peace. As Van Oosterzee well remarks (as quoted above), "Messianic prophecy is the *continuation* of a golden string of promises, with which the *Pentateuch had already* made the prophets and their contemporaries acquainted."

But not only did the Messianic Idea have life and reality in these primitive ages; it possessed then a peculiar grandeur which it is important to note. What had been all along the chief and central thought concerning this promised Offspring of humanity? That in Him was to center a blessing that should affect all mankind. And what was to constitute the blessing? It was to be a *blessing* as involving redemption from the *curse*! When the instrument of the curse lay writhing at Jehovah's feet,

His promise said that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. What could this mean but that the force and vitality of the *curse* should be broken? Nothing else or less than this could be the purport of Jehovah's words at such a moment, in such connection; and to nothing else or less than this could the human heart cling for comfort and hope, when the misery of the curse began to rankle within the guilt-stricken soul. But what stupendous task was this! With the curse of Jehovah yet ringing in the ear, while the fiat of the insulted majesty of Deity was yet fulminating just doom for broken laws,—the mind of man was made to think of one who should arrest the execution of that awful sentence. Some one should arise, who would receive in Himself the blow of divine justice armed with almighty power, and then, scarce hurt, only bruised in the heel, would turn and crush forever the monstrous provocation of almighty wrath, bruising the serpent's or Satan's head! What must be thought of such a Being? True, He was to be of the seed of woman; but that matchless strength must come to Him from a higher source, altogether superhuman. Does not the idea whose history we are tracing, here rise into proportions so august, and embrace magnitudes so overwhelming, that we are carried beyond the merely human? Yea are we not brought into the very presence of Deity? And does it not seem possible therefore that something more than human, perhaps even divinity itself, may have entered into the conceptions of the promised Seed, in the very earliest times?

If it should be objected here that such a conception was too far beyond those primitive periods and early stages of development, we reply that an actual personal union of the human and divine was frequently present to the senses of the Patriarchs. What else were the Theophanies: the appearances of the Angel of the Lord, or the Angel of the Covenant? This mysterious Being, (whom we under the gospel dispensation have no hesitation in identifying with the Son of God), was the visible Representative of Deity to the Patriarchs. Speaking for God, He yet often spake as if God in His own Person; saying not merely

‘God saith thus,’ but often, ‘*I say, I go, I do this or that thing.*’ He came in the form of a traveller to Abraham’s tent in the evening of the day, and partook of the good cheer that was provided. He as a man wrestled with Jacob at the brook, yet Jacob called the spot “Peniel,” in commemoration of the awful fact that he had seen God face to face. Here then was a distinct mingling of the human and divine: the eye saw the human, yet the deepest consciousness of the beholder was made unmistakably aware of Deity. Now could these Theophanies have been brought before the minds of the early believers, without encouraging the idea of some mysterious yet undoubted connection between these manifestations of God in human form, and the great Deliverer to come? This Saviour was constantly their hope, and faith in Him even then was the life of their souls; the thought of Him therefore could not have been far from their minds at any time. But the *work* He was to do had already convinced them of the necessity of *superhuman* and *superangelic* powers: might not His *Person* therefore realize some such union of Deity and Humanity, as they had looked upon in the Angel of the Lord? In later ages of the church the Messiah was actually called the Angel of Jehovah’s Presence, and the Angel of the Covenant (Isai. 63: 9; Malachi 3: 1): and it does not seem to us greatly extravagant to suppose, that to the Messianic Idea in this its earlier development, the conception of Divinity was not at all foreign. True, the Idea was as yet vague and indistinct in many important particulars. It was an ardent Hope, a glad Conviction; and beyond these it had no name whereby it could be distinguished, no associations which could fix it upon the very Person who should fulfill its conditions. But this vagueness did not lessen its reality: nor need it have interfered with a clear apprehension of its surpassing spiritual grandeur. Indeed we think that because vague, because unassociated with material glory and earthly majesty, (as will appear more clearly further on), it could be entertained the better in its spiritual purity and power.

Having now traced the earlier life of the Messianic Idea, and

found nothing repugnant to the conception of Divinity under these its primitive aspects; we must inquire at this point, what do the actual Messianic Prophecies have to say in this regard? Have they an uncertain sound, are they utterly without witness to the Messiah's Divinity? Or, on the other hand, do they bear testimony in plainest terms to this sublime conception?

Whatever the prophets may declare in regard to Messiah's earthly, or kingly, greatness as the successor of his father David; we are content to turn to a few prophecies which speak in strains exalted far above earth. These announce distinctly and specifically the Divinity of the Messiah: their language is not to be mistaken; and they are familiar to all. Isaiah (vii. 14) exclaims: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." Strangely significant name this: "God with us." God who is "not far from every one of us" at any time, is yet so especially near unto us in this child miraculously born, that His very name expresses it. But Isaiah (ix. 6) has more to say of this child: he expresses the dignity of his nature by an accumulation of astounding appellations: "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Are there no ascriptions of Divinity in these amazing titles? Would it be blasphemy for any one in whom this Prophecy was to be fulfilled—(and who else but Messiah could fulfil it?)—to claim Divinity? Jeremiah (xxiii. 6) has another name for the Messiah: "This is his name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousness." That unspeakable Name, too sacred to be taken upon the lips even in moments of holiest worship, that Name here is unhesitatingly applied to the Messiah? Is it then robbery for Him to claim equality with God: can we fairly exclude the Divinity from our conceptions concerning Him? Micah (v. 2) congratulated Bethlehem of Judah because it was to be distinguished as the birth-place of the Messiah. But the very idea of a birth, of an entrance upon a human existence, precludes the idea of Divinity: God does not become, *He is*. To prevent such mistaken conception con-

cerning the Messiah, the prophet is made to declare in this immediate connection: "Whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of Eternity." If Eternity can be truly predicated only of Deity, then the Messiah is Divine.

We are aware that the Jews may call into serious question the interpretation that we have given to these various passages. We may be entirely wrong in reading such meanings in them. We may have missed altogether the true force or drift of the original. They are entirely welcome to make such criticisms. But we ask, why do they not exhibit to us what is the correct bearing of these Scriptures? Can not they, or those who make common cause with them on this question, put forth some edition of these ancient books, that shall have the confidence of fair and upright, as well as ripe scholars on both sides? As long as these Scriptures are left as they are, and their translation compels the use of such words in our language as we find in our Bible, we cannot help drawing inferences from them which confirm us in the belief that the Messiah was to be Divine.

But we may adduce still other passages from the Old Testament Scriptures. A certain inspired writer in the Apostolic days of the Church, (perhaps the Apostle Paul himself,) had occasion to argue this very point, wishing to establish to the satisfaction of Jewish critics the Divinity of the Christ. We find this argument in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews; and we find it mainly based on quotations from the Psalms. The writer makes such telling points as these: The Messiah is greater than the angels, "for unto which of the angels said he at any time [as he *did* say to Messiah, Ps. 2: 7,] Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?" Compelled to rise above such exalted beings, is there any limit to the height of glory to which our conceptions may ascend? It would seem not, as we listen further to words addressed unmistakably to the Messiah. "Unto the Son he saith (Ps. 45: 6,) 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!' And (Ps. 192: 25-7,) "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands.

They shall perish but thou remainest . . . thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

The Jews may, again, utterly repudiate these passages, especially as quoted by one who was a renegade to their faith. Besides they may make a point of what we ourselves must notice, that the quotations are not absolutely exact; and in case of the last bear no evidence on their face that they apply to the Messiah. But still we think there is some weight in the following considerations. Here was a learned Jew (whether Apollos, or Paul, or an unknown writer, but certainly a Jew of learning,) arguing with Jews; not with Jews who held fast unwaveringly the faith of Christ; but Jews who were trying to escape the conviction that Jesus was the Messiah, who wished to renounce faith in Him to avoid the vexatious and perilous persecutions of their countrymen. With such opponents spurious quotations, or interpretations plainly at variance with the spirit of the passage quoted, would have been manifestly useless. The fact that this writer employs with confidence these passages to sustain his argument for the Divinity of the Messiah, proves that a fair and honest interpretation compels such an understanding of them.—We conclude therefore that the Messianic Idea, studied under all its aspects from earliest to latest developments; whether living as a glorious Hope among the Patriarchs, or brought under the influence of its associations with the house and throne of David; both from the nature of the conceptions involved, and by the distinct and specific statement of Sacred writers,—includes the Divinity of the Messiah. Reading the Old Testament aright, we must believe that the Messiah was to be Divine.

II. *This idea gradually debased through carnally literal interpretations, suggested at first by national distresses, and subsequently intensified under the influence of widespread spiritual declension.*

It must not be forgotten that the conclusion reached at the close of the previous head, is simply *our* conclusion, reading the Old Testament Scriptures from the standpoint of the Chris-

tian. As we have indicated more than once, it is *not* the conclusion reached by Jews in general. Both to-day and at the time of Christ, the opinion concerning the Messiah most popular and prevalent, allows no ascriptions of Divinity. Does that palpable fact necessarily overthrow our conclusions? Have we so signally failed in interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures; or can we discover special reasons which prevent a fair and spiritual reading of these Scriptures by the Jews themselves?

Up to the time of the strictly Messianic period in the development of the Promise concerning the Saviour of the world, there was no difficulty in preserving intact its high spiritual character. But at this stage, while it gains definiteness by means of its name and associations, it also becomes exposed to the danger of being narrowed and materialized. The people of God are no longer a band of Patriarchs bearing about with them a blessing which shall be upon all the nations of the earth, and fixing their faith upon a Redeemer of all the race. They have become a nation, and a spirit of intense nationality possesses them. The outside world are "strangers to the commonwealth of Israel" and of God; they are Gentiles, unclean, doomed in their sins, having no lot or portion with favored Israel. All things are for Israel at the expense of the Gentiles: not, as God told Abraham, for Israel, that all nations might be blessed in him. And this narrow, ungenerous, exclusive spirit influences the Messianic Idea which is at this time growing into greater clearness among the people. It gets the name Messiah from their own anointed King; and the idea of its world-embracing blessedness is gradually swallowed up in the literal associations that this name brings with it. There comes a time when the Messianic Hope is satisfied with looking forward to some great son of David seated upon David's throne. All the prophecies of exceeding glory, and even eternal majesty, cannot turn them away from this low and material expectation. The sum and substance of their Messianic conceptions, the crowning honor of their *beau ideal* Messiah, is that he is David's son. All these great prophecies mean only that he, seated upon

his father's throne, will make the Kingdom of Israel great and powerful. Breaking in pieces the magnificent empires of the world, a more magnificent and more universal empire was to rise on their ruins, with Jerusalem as its capital, the excellency of all the earth. From the Messiah, the founder of this empire and its first glorious King, a line of descendants would perpetually flow, to occupy this throne till the end of time; and thus the promise to David that his throne should be an everlasting throne, would be fulfilled. To accomplish this great mission, miraculous power and wisdom would be given to Messiah; just as Elijah had performed miracles, and Moses with outstretched arm and potent rod had bidden the waters of the Red Sea to open a passage to Israel. But amid all these thrilling descriptions and glowing expectations, not the remotest idea of Divinity remained.

Now, why should this idea have been lost? If indeed it ever belonged to Messianic conceptions, why should the people have let it slip so utterly away from them? We learn the reason as we trace their history after the captivity. There was a succession of empires,—Babylonian, Persian, Greek, Roman; illustrating in tangible forms the possibility of universal sway by one ruling nation. But meanwhile, the distress of the nation as a nation grows with the centuries. As empire follows empire, the Jews only know of them as oppression succeeding oppression, and each outrivalling the other in cruelty. Thus the necessity of *national* deliverance increases. There have been prophecies about a Deliverer who should bear sway over the Gentiles: that must mean the establishment of a universal kingdom such as they had grown familiar with, of which Jerusalem should be the queen city, instead of Babylon, or Alexandria, or Rome. That seems now to be Israel's growing need, and therefore the Messiah as a *national* Deliverer, as a merely *human* King and Saviour, is more and more intensely longed for, and therefore more exclusively as such believed in. Besides this intense yearning for an *earthly* kingdom of glory to compensate Israel for all his dire sorrows; the terrible oppression which the people endured

for so many centuries embittered them against the already despised Gentiles, and made their hatred and aversion almost insane. The thought of benefits to them became utterly insufferable: and their national exclusiveness reached a degree of intensity incomparably beyond that of their national life under their own great kings. Now, amid this state of things, there was no room whatever for the conception of Divinity in regard to the Messiah. If that idea had been retained, it would have compelled a more spiritual interpretation of Messiah's universal sway, and discouraged these hopes of earthly glory: a present God in the expected Deliverer would suggest at once a bestowal of blessing upon all the fallen race. For a salvation from *spiritual* evils, an abolishing of sin and the redemption of the human soul, must necessarily commend themselves as objects far more worthy the exertions of a Divine Being, than a deliverance from merely *national* miseries. Even the more difficult projects of deliverance from Egypt, and the conquest of Palestine, had been committed to men. The idea that God must needs come upon earth in actual personal presence to overthrow the Persians, Greeks, or Romans, would border on blasphemy. This very incongruity had contributed, no doubt, to rob the Messianic Idea of Divinity: the *national* deliverer, who was *all* their hope, was to be no more than a human king. And the retention of the idea of divinity, through this same incongruity, would have exalted their views of Messiah's work, and the nature of His Kingdom. But under a spiritual deliverance, more nations than their own must be included: since Gentiles needed a salvation from sin no less, yea quite as much as the Jews. Thus this idea of Divinity militated against the two most prominent and powerful passions of the Jewish heart: the passion for national supremacy, and the passion of hatred against the Gentiles: it must, therefore, have been peculiarly offensive. Naturally, then, the Jews bent their minds to look only upon the carnally literal side of Messianic Prophecy, and the conception of Divinity possible to the more spiritual minds of the Patriarchs was allowed to vanish; until in the time of Christ the last

traces have disappeared. Then wide-spread spiritual declension had created a popular distaste for all spiritual things: their very worship of God had become a mass of petty carnal ordinances, harassing, hampering, and truly "hedging" the life and soul. Then under Pharisaic leadership, there were no scruples to forbid a wilful blinding of the mind, a stiff-necked refusal to accept anything in any direction which would overthrow fond and glowing pre-judgments; or to prevent a deliberate endeavor to turn from their real meaning and true spiritual bearing the very plainest passages of Scripture. And thus it could easily happen that, in spite of those Scriptures out of which we have just read the Divinity of the Messiah, "the prevailing idea of the Rabbis and the people alike, in Christ's day, was that the Messiah would be simply a great prince, who should found a kingdom of matchless splendor. Nor was the idea of His heavenly origin at all universal; almost all fancied He would be only a human hero, who should lead them to victory." And "it was to a people drunk with the vision of such outward felicity and political greatness, under a world-conquering Messiah, that Jesus Christ came, with His utterly opposite doctrines of the aim and nature of the Messiah and His kingdom." (Geikie, *Life of Christ*, vi.) No wonder that He was crucified; no wonder that these ideas, inherited by their posterity, thoroughly ingrained into the very blood and sinew of the Jewish heart in every age, should hinder their acceptance of Jesus, who claimed a Divinity which they will not and cannot ascribe to Messiah.

III. *This Idea held in its purity by Jews of devout and spiritual minds, unbiassed by carnal hopes or prejudices.*

If it was only a perversity of mind that prevented the acknowledgment of Messiah's Divinity by the Jews; if it was only because of a veil of selfishness or carnal blindness upon their hearts, that they could not read that Divinity in their own Scriptures;—have we any evidence that those who read with unprejudiced and candid hearts, reached this exalted conception and confidently entertained this belief? If we can bring forward instances of such a belief among the cotemporaries of Jesus, it will show that

to some Jewish minds at least there was enough in the Old Testament declarations concerning the Messiah to warrant them in ascribing to Him essential equality with God.

Shortly after the angelic annunciation, Mary visits her cousin, Elizabeth. A thrill of joy trembles through her frame, and she exclaims: "And whence is this to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" Zacharias, her husband, a godly man of whom with his wife the Sacred Record says: "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless;" a priest uninfluenced by Pharisaic pride or policy;—spake by the Holy Ghost at the birth of his child, John: "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways." Thus we find these two eminently pious people, unhesitatingly speaking in terms of Divine Honor about the Messiah, in whose near coming they were permitted to rejoice. They do it with a naturalness and a spontaneity which indicate that it was the constant conviction of their hearts; that to them it never occurred that Messiah could be anything less than Divine.

Again we hear the words of an Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile: a candid man, who looked at truth in its own light, unalloyed by that supplied from his own narrow prejudices, his preconceived hopes or desires. Nathanael approached Jesus: Jesus gives indubitable proof that He saw him in his solitude afar off, and knew his thoughts in a moment of holiest meditation. And Nathanael is compelled to the irresistible confession: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." To Nathanael's mind Messiah, or the King of Israel, must necessarily also be Divine; for he is no sooner convinced that he stands face to face with the Messiah, than he addresses Him as the Son of God.

Jesus meets a Samaritan woman at the well near Sychar. He discourses on heavenly things. He plainly rebukes her for her sins past and present. The woman goes into the city and announces the conviction that she has met the Messiah: "Come,

see a man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?" The fact that an inseparable attribute of Deity, Omnipotence, was manifested by the man at the well, is proof sufficient to her, and soon to all the city, that here indeed was the Messiah!

A company of Christ's disciples are in a ship in mid-sea; a storm is raging, and they are in peril of their lives. Suddenly a human shape is seen moving over the turbulent billows. The voice of Jesus is heard to say: "Be of good cheer: it is I, be not afraid!" He enters the ship, and the storm ceases. "Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth, thou art the Son of God." Amazing blasphemy this, to fall down at a man's feet and address such language to him, as if he were a God. But in the sudden revulsion from terror to safety, the deeper feelings of the heart came uppermost, and bore witness to the profound conviction that here in this act of Divine Power was an evidence of the Messiah's presence, and that Messiah was the Son of God!

If the Jews will scarce allow us our own interpretations of the Old Testament Scriptures, we have much less hope of expecting their acquiescence in citations from the New. It may seem ridiculously vain to bring forward the instances just mentioned to prove a point to their satisfaction. Those, however, who would plant themselves on their ground, in this assault upon a vital doctrine of Christian faith,—profess to accept these New Testament Scriptures, and deny that doctrine because they cannot find it in these Scriptures. In the case of these latter it is hard to see how they can escape the force of the instances to which we have alluded. But if some of their number go farther, and join the Jews in the declaration that the instances mentioned are of no force, inasmuch as they must be looked upon as spurious, gotten up for the purpose of making a point,—we think we can still present a few considerations which ought to have some weight even with them. It must be admitted that just at the times and under the circumstances where these expressions of adoration occur, the heart's depths would be stirred and utter

its profoundest feelings, no matter what might otherwise be the restrictions externally and artificially imposed upon belief and its avowal. But our opponents may tell us that this but illustrates the consummate skill of the narrators in making out their point. Then we ask, how do our Jewish friends and those who profit by their opposition to our doctrine of Christ,—how do they account for the necessity on the part of the Evangelists for making out this point? *Why* did these Jewish writers wish to prove, even by spurious means, the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ? Whatever could have induced them to inaugurate such a conception, and foist it upon their contemporaries? It was natural that they should want to convince the Jews that Jesus was the promised Messiah. But was it likely that the setting up of the claim of Divinity would advance their desire? This interpretation of the Messiah's character was so radically different from the general opinion of the Jews, and so desperately adverse to it, that they could have invented no worse method of conciliating the Jews and gaining them over to the faith of Christ. Nay more, on merely natural principles, how could such an idea even suggest itself to them? No people on earth exceed the Jews in their tenacity of national feelings. How then could an idea so utterly unnational rise up within their hearts? Again, the public proclamation of such a doctrine, so unpopular, so heterodox, involved no little peril. It really, therefore, seems to require no very great amount of either candor or penetration to be convinced that nothing could have induced the Christian disciples to the hazardous and extremely impolitic work of proclaiming in their preaching, or disseminating by their writings, the Doctrine of the Divinity of the Messiah, except they had read it in their inspired Scriptures, and on that account felt constrained to accept it as the Truth.

The state of opinion among the Jews, so strongly and fiercely opposed to our view of the truth concerning Christ, which is indicated by Canon Wordsworth's interesting citations, need not disturb our equanimity. It is well that they should challenge our earnest attention. It is well that we should not suppress

the important facts which they disclose. But these facts cannot be made to do what some would no doubt be glad to make them accomplish. It has been our humble endeavor to show, that even these facts,—as so many others wherewith men have sought to undermine Christian faith,—may but help us to understand the Gospel better, and invite to investigations which shall root and ground us the more firmly in the faith.

ART. IV.—PUNISHMENT: ITS GROUND AND ENDS.

BY REV. C. R. LANE, PH. D. CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

THE two great *desiderata* of Civilized Society are, in the first place, Order, and in the next Liberty; and the two great dangers to which Civilized Society is exposed are Despotism on the one hand and Anarchy on the other.

In the choice of evils, despotism is less to be feared than anarchy, because despotism is the historical refuge in which men hide themselves from anarchy; and in the next, because without order there can be no such thing as liberty. For liberty in the civil sense is the natural freedom of each man regulated by the rights of every other man; and men organized into civil communities need the prosperity that comes of order, that they may have something to defend and the material resources with which they may be able to defend the rights they have and to acquire others.

This process of defending and acquiring must go on, as things now are, until the whole fabric of society rests upon mutual rights and duties distributed throughout the whole body of citizens; for it is only in such a state of things that there is no just ground of complaint on the part of any, and that it is the interest as well as the duty of all to defend the rights and enforce the duties of each. When, therefore, this point is reached,

viz. the common interests of all in the rights and duties of each, then men have reached the highest attainable point of excellence in government and also the best security the nature of the case admits of, that what they have secured will be permanent.

The greatest triumph of Statesmanship, therefore, is the mingling of liberty and order, the two great elements of civil welfare, in such a manner as will secure the largest amount of liberty consistent with the most absolute security for the maintenance of order.

The same truth, stated in other words, is, Civilized Society needs as much liberty as will prevent order from becoming despotism, and as much order as will prevent liberty from becoming license and producing anarchy. For, when either of these elements is largely in excess, the great pendulum of Society begins to swing from one extreme to the other, from despotism to anarchy and from anarchy back again to despotism. But men being what they are, it is plain that liberty cannot be maintained against despotism, nor order against license without penalties. Correct views, therefore, with respect to punishment are of the greatest importance, because in this subject are involved both the welfare of all considered as a whole in view of the danger to which the organization is exposed from the evil doing of individuals, and the security of the individual against injustice from the organized whole.

I.

The meritorious and exclusive ground of punishment is ill-desert. For, when no ill is deserved, no ill ought to be received, and when ill is deserved, then ill ought to be received. For,

1st. Such is the testimony of the transgressor's own conscience with regard to himself. He feels that he has done wrong and that he ought to suffer for the wrong he has done; and he fears that he will suffer for it. In consequence of this feeling he tries intuitively to hide his wrong-doing from the knowledge of his fellows, not merely as a mistake exposing him to ridicule,

or damage calling for reparation, but as a crime demanding expiation by way of suffering punishment.

2nd. The common judgment of mankind testifies to the same purpose in relation to the wrong-doing of others. The natural—natural, because, universal, unavoidable and irrepressible—judgment of men is that the evil-doer deserves ill because he has done ill and that he ought to receive ill. This is the common, spontaneous judgment of men, when a great crime arrests their attention; or when one believed to be a great criminal escapes the punishment felt to be due to his crimes.

3d. The same thing is shown by the shame and disgrace that attend the discovery of crime.

All men are so constituted that they desire the approbation of their fellow-men and fear their reproach. This is an elementary principle in human nature, and the very efforts men make to gain the favorable opinion of their fellows by a fair exterior and to avoid their unfavorable judgment show what views every man thinks every other man takes of wrong-doing.

Wrong-doing, therefore, because it is wrong-doing deserves punishment; and therefore the wrong-doer has the same title to punishment that the innocent have to protection, viz, desert. Ill-desert, therefore, is the meritorious ground of punishment, positively, because they who deserve ill ought to receive ill and exclusively, because he who has done no wrong deserves no punishment.

When evil-doing is considered in its relation to Law, then the formal ground of punishment is guilt, that is ill-desert judicially ascertained and declared.

Among men no other rule is safe, as all experience proves.

Suspicion may be correct or incorrect. Popular opinion, often uninformed as to the facts, swayed by strong feeling and unconscious of accountability for results either to the alleged criminal or to the Public, is very likely to err in estimating the degree of criminality, even when it is right as to the fact, and the amount of deserved punishment in the way of undue severity and of too great leniency: and in the fact it com

monly errs in both directions, being at first too severe and then too lenient. Vengeance gives place to pity; and between the two there is a failure of justice. Judicial investigation therefore, involving full information and a sense of responsibility both to the Public and the accused, is the safest way to secure the protection of the innocent and the punishment of the guilty without injury to the interest of any.

When, therefore, the fact of ill-desert has been made out and the degree of it within the limits of the statute duly considered, then and not before is the time for the sentence expressive of and exposing to the punishment deserved. As among men, therefore, guilt, that is, the fact of ill-desert and its legal quality judicially ascertained and declared is the formal and proximate ground of punishment.

II.

The ends of punishment are various.

1st. When the Law is viewed as an authoritative declaration that certain things are wrong; then the end of punishment standing directly related to its meritorious ground, is to punish the evil-doer because he is an evil-doer, that is, because he deserves punishment; just as the innocent are protected because they are innocent, and therefore deserve to be protected. Desert is the ground in each case equally; and equally in each case both the innocent and the guilty ought to be treated as they deserve.

On the other hand, when the ground of desert is absent, then either protection or punishment on any other ground is simply wrong in itself and therefore sure to work out injury. For it breaks down in the minds of all concerned the distinction between right and wrong, and so weakens the bonds that hold men together. It is favor to the bad at the expense of the good, a stab at order, for order exists that each one may be treated according to his deserts; and also at liberty, for it is an invasion of the rights of those who do well.

The first end of punishment, therefore, is to punish the evil-doer, because he is an evil-doer, that is, to treat him as he de-

serves. For, as, on the one hand, where no ill is deserved, no ill ought to be received; so on the other, where ill is deserved, it ought to be received.

2nd. When the Law is viewed as declaring the kind and the measure of the ill deserved, then the end of punishment is to satisfy the penalty imposed by the sentence.

All laws ought to be just, both as to the duties they require and the penalties they impose; and in free states they are so, as a rule, according to the moral convictions of the great mass of the citizens, and also in regard to what is to be believed to be their interests. For the office of the Law is equally to protect, on the one hand, the rights of all from the depredations of each, and on the other the rights of each from invasion of all. But a law unjust either in its requirements or penalties is among the greatest of evils, for it destroys what it is intended to preserve, and that in the most effectual way. For the evil as legalized and organic is strong; and what is much worse, it shows that the evil is intrenched—at least for the time in the passions or indifference, or worse still, permanently in the settled convictions of the community.

Again: Failure to inflict penalty shows a lack of moral courage, because what is believed and declared to be right in a legislative capacity is judicially declared to be a matter of indifference. This inconsistency is a proclamation of license to the ill-disposed and an invitation to the badly ambitious to prey upon the Public. It is incipient anarchy, and at the same time and for the same reason incipient despotism.

As a practical matter also involving confidence in the protecting power of the Law and therefore a feeling of security in society, penalties ought to be enforced with a firm hand and to the full extent of desert, because as a fact there is much less complaint of injustice and much less ground for it in regard to the law than in regard to its administration.

To satisfy the penal claims of the law, therefore, is an end of punishment right in itself and necessary to maintain the rights of each and of all. Failure in enforcing penalty, therefore, is

one of the highest crimes that can be committed, because it strikes at the very existence of government; and one of the most alarming, for it is the proof of indifference to crime on the part of the whole community that permits it, as well as of the officers of the law on whom the immediate responsibility rests. This crime, crime for no weaker word will express the idea, needs to be guarded against; because the appeal is to that natural compassion which pities the suffering, and does not always consider that under the form of favor to the guilty it is inflicting the most cruel wrongs on the innocent.

3d. When the law is viewed as the embodied sovereignty of society and the representative of it, as to the rights and duties of those from whom it demands obedience, then the end of punishment is to maintain the authority of the law, and as a consequence, its efficiency to protect those subject to it.

The authority of the law must be maintained as supreme, in the first place against the will of its officers to prevent despotism and on the other, against the passions of the multitude, which tend to anarchy: that is, The penalties must be such and so enforced that they are a barrier to the commission of crime to all without distinction and then they will be a defence to those who do well. For all, the high and the low will learn that the majesty of the law, armed with just penalties and upheld by the moral convictions and the material interests of the whole body of citizens, is something with which it is not safe to trifle. Such sovereignty, just in its demands and impartial in its processes, is a terror to evil-doers and a ground of confidence to those who do well; and it cannot be a ground of confidence to the one class, unless it is also an object of fear to the other; for if the guilty are not punished, the innocent cannot be protected.

4th. When the Law is viewed as the safeguard of Society against the depredations of the ill-disposed, an important end of punishment is to prevent crime.

In this case, the appeal is primarily and prominently to fear; but as fear always implies hope, the appeal is really to both

these principles. These principles, hope and fear, are natural and as natural, indifferent in a moral point of view; but they become right or wrong, noble or base, in particular circumstances. Joy, for example, in prospect of the triumph of right and the dread of doing wrong are noble emotions, morally right, elevated and elevating; while delight in the success of wickedness, and fear, as cowardice in maintaining or doing what is believed to be right, are wrong feelings, base and debasing. In the one case, therefore, they ought to be restrained from bringing forth their proper fruit, for the same reason that in the other, they ought to be encouraged. Indeed, a government that is not feared is worthless, and must soon give way to something else. It is right, therefore, to restrain evil feelings by the fear of suffering; and to make the suffering so great, and if possible, so certain that the advantage may always appear evidently on the side of obedience.

Again: Crime is always both an injury and loss to society, and society has the inherent right to protect itself against the moral injury and material loss caused by the commission of crime, in any way that is right in its nature and efficient to its end. It is on this principle, in part, that the education of a part of the community at the expense of the whole is justifiable, viz., because it is better morally and cheaper pecuniarily to prevent the commission of crime than to punish it when committed.

In regard to this subject, a mistake is sometimes made, that deserves attention, viz., the prevention of crime has been elevated from the rank of an end to be gained by means of punishment into that of a ground, and even the only ground upon which punishment ought to be inflicted.

To this view there are grave objections: (1) It tends to put out of sight and out of consideration the elementary difference between right and wrong; and to put in its place the ideas of benefit and injury, profit and loss; and therefore to build the superstructure of Government on the foundation of mere civil right, instead of moral right, which experience teaches, is none too deep and none too firm.

(2) It reduces crime to the level of damage, and thereby strips it of its moral character contrary to the intuitive perceptions and spontaneous judgment of men; and therefore makes the infliction of punishment a matter of calculation rather than of right, of expediency rather than of principle, and so in some cases, at least in theory, a matter of choice instead of a matter of obligation: that is, it makes society a sovereign even as against right and duty, competent to demand more or less than the evil (on this theory the injurious) act deserves, or not to punish it at all.

(3) In determining penalties, the important question, on this theory, would be, not what does the transgressor of the law deserve but what will keep him from repeating the criminal (injurious) act and prevent others from doing it? and in some instances, the answer would certainly be, more or less punishment than the act, considered simply as to its evil nature, deserves. This would, on the one hand, justify injustice; and on the other, it would always make the criminal to some extent a martyr and often to the same extent a hero, in the estimation of the very persons who need every righteous restraint upon their conduct.

(4) On the supposition that the prevention of crime is the only ground of punishment, the case actually occurs in which it is wrong, if the word wrong has any meaning, to punish evil-doing, namely, the case of lost spirits, men and angels. For it is certain that their suffering does not and will not prevent them from sinning; and the only ground left is that they are punished as an example to deter others. But if they do not deserve what they receive; then the example itself is a display of injustice, an outrage on the rights of those who suffer undeservedly and also on the intuitive moral conviction of those for whose benefit they are supposed to suffer!

These two views, therefore, namely, ill-desert and the prevention of crime are incompatible as the ground of punishment; but they are both consistent with each other and in harmony with all the facts in the case, when the one is viewed as the ground and the other as an end of punishment.

5th. In addition to these ends of punishment, which relate to the ill-desert of the criminal and the public welfare, but subordinate to them, there is another, which ought to be considered, namely, the good of the offender.

Crimes are committed with every conceivable degree of malignity, and somewhere there is a line which divides the corrigible from the incorrigible.

First: In regard to the corrigible, the penalty ought not to be set aside, for that would be wrong in itself and injurious in its consequences, especially in the way of encouraging crime; but in as much as, in the present state of things, no man and no law is perfect, suffering as a chastisement ought to go with suffering as a punishment. In order to secure this end, two things are necessary: the one, legal; namely such a degree of suffering as will convince the evil-doer that evil doing is a real disadvantage to him; and the other moral, that is, such sympathy for the criminal, not for his crime, as will encourage and help him to reform. This is the duty and it is no less the interest of society towards those offenders who are yet hopefully corrigible.

Secondly: When the depravity made manifest in the crime or series of crimes shows that the criminal is incorrigible, then capital punishment ought to follow, that is, punishment from which is excluded all regard to the interest of the criminal, and in which the only thing considered is the welfare of others. This end, in the given case, can be secured with certainty only by taking away all power to do evil in the future.

On this principle, the incorrigible child is disowned and disinherited, the incorrigible scholar is expelled, and the hater of his fellow to the extent of murder, is hanged, and also the pirate whom all civilized nations regard and treat as the enemy of mankind. In the extreme case of incorrigibility, therefore, the ill-desert of the criminal's lawless and law-destroying conduct, and the injury wrought by it, put society on the defense, and then the question is in one form, which is to perish, the good or the bad? and in another, which is to prevail, order securing

safety, or a state of anarchy in which men are exposed to danger in proportion to their uprightness?

The correct view, therefore, correct because it meets every aspect of the case, is, on the one hand, to punish on the ground of ill-desert, judicially ascertained and in proportion to it; and on the other, by such penalties as will secure as fully as possible all the ends of punishment. This theory, intelligently and faithfully applied, will satisfy the intuitive sense of desert and of duty in view of it, maintain the authority of the Law and protect society from the depredations of the individuals who are disposed to prey upon it. It will secure these results, not indeed perfectly, but to such an extent as will maintain the peace and good order of society and at the same time leave the liberty of each citizen as large as the common welfare and his own will permit.

ART. V.—CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BY REV. CALVIN S. GERHARD, A. M.

THE first of April, 1834, will ever be memorable in the history of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. On that day an act was finally passed by the Legislature, contrary to the wishes of the people, but in accordance with the earnest desire of the Governor, the Hon. George Wolf, making provision for the establishment of free public schools throughout the State. As might be expected, the new law was in many respects defective, and at once met with very general and violent opposition. During the Legislative session of 1834-35 more than a thousand petitions were presented, begging for the repeal of the so-called and so-considered obnoxious enactment. Most of the representatives quailed before the popular clamor, and very few indeed had sufficient courage to defend the measure openly. But the mighty commoner, great even as a stripling youth when a representative from Adams county, Thaddeus Stevens, was there, and, taking up the cause of the people, opposed as he was by their own ignorance and blind resistance, with that same disinterested love and devotion which afterwards made him such a colossal power in the United States Congress, surmounted all opposition and, by his eloquent appeal, saved the system to the State. But it was so unpopular that during the first year it was in operation only ninety-three districts out of the nine hundred accepted it.

In 1835, Joseph Ritner, a "Pennsylvania German" farmer's son, of very limited educational advantages, but a man of more than ordinary ability, succeeded Wolf as Governor. Like his predecessor, he fully appreciated the importance of

popular education, and did all in his power to further the interests of the new system of instruction. One of his first official acts was the appointment of Thomas H. Burrowes as Secretary of the Commonwealth. One of the duties of this office, at that time, was to superintend the common schools. Mr. Burrowes, who was a zealous advocate and an intelligent and devoted friend of the new schools, was thus placed into the position in which he could make his influence most powerfully felt in their behalf.

In this way the good work, so auspiciously commenced, was vigorously carried forward, the friends of the movement doing all they possibly could to further its interests. With the view of correcting the defects of the first enactment, a new bill was presented during the Legislative session of 1835 "to consolidate and amend the several acts in relation to a system of education by common schools." One of the peculiar features of the new law, intended to reconcile the people, was "local option," the citizens of each district being permitted to vote every third year on the question as to whether the schools should be continued or not. To make it a success, therefore, it was highly important that the system should be properly explained to the people and put into operation as speedily as possible. This great work Mr. Burrowes, the superintendent, undertook to perform. "He visited nearly all the counties in the State, delivered addresses, explained the law, prepared the necessary forms, and succeeded in placing the system upon a firm basis." So great was his success that, in the third and last report made during his term of office under Governor Ritner, he was able to present the following statistics: Accepting districts, 840 (a gain of 747); number of schools, 5,269 (a gain of 4,818); and number of pupils, 174,733 (a gain of 154,869).

Important changes and marked improvements were made in the law from time to time, until the system gradually commended itself more and more fully to the people. "Opposition to it accordingly began to disappear, and in 1848 an act was passed extending it over the entire State, the people having pre-

viously in the triennial election, in every part of the State, voted, with remarkable unanimity, for the continuance of the schools which a few years before they had so strenuously opposed. In 1854 a general school law was passed, creating the office of county superintendent and inaugurating numerous important changes and improvements, among others introducing uniformity of text-books into the schools of each district. The normal school act was passed in 1857, the law of which divided the State into twelve districts, allowing one normal school in each. At the same time there was a law enacted separating the office of State Superintendent from that of Secretary of the Commonwealth, and establishing the department of common schools. The office of City Superintendent was created in 1867. At the same time teachers' institutes were legalized in all the counties of the State, and authority was given to the State Superintendent to issue permanent certificates to teachers possessing the necessary qualifications. The statistics of 1876 give the following figures: Number of districts, 2,103; number of schools, 17,497; number of graded schools, 5,957; number of pupils, 902,345; cost of tuition, \$4,856,888.91; cost of school-houses, \$1,785,148.87; total cost of system, \$9,163,928.68; state appropriation, \$1,000,000.00.

Such is a brief history of the common school system of Pennsylvania, showing how it has been gradually advancing in efficiency and popular favor during the last forty-eight years. Its most zealous friends do not claim that it has reached perfection, but this much is certain—that it is striding rapidly forward, and, in its own sphere, displacing all other systems of instruction. It is beginning to be very generally admitted that private schools cannot compete with the public schools in furnishing children with opportunities for training in elementary education. These schools, from the primary to the secondary, up through the grammar to the high schools, are thorough and efficient. The strong arm of the law furnishes them with abundant and vigorous support. Private schools and academies have

seen their day. The latter can at present only be supported in rural communities where the population is too sparse to admit of graded schools culminating in a high school.

Whether we are satisfied with the common-school system or not, these schools certainly are an established fact, and doing effective service in educating the rising generation. Before they were introduced, three months was the average length of the school term, and children were fortunate if they learned to "read, write and cipher." From the beginning of the present century to the year 1834, what has been not inaptly called the "pauper system" was in force, the children in all the schools being divided into two classes known as pay scholars and paupers. The whole number of children brought into these schools the last year they were in operation (1833) was only 17,467, whilst in 1837 there were 174,733 in the public schools. Does this not prove, making all proper allowance for the number of pupils who attended the parochial schools in 1833, that there was still a large number of children who were out of school altogether that year, constituting a vast army in danger of growing up illiterates, and also that the public schools gained immensely in popularity in an almost incredibly short time? The fact that these schools were free to everybody, and that all had to pay tax for their support, had a great deal to do with the matter, but does not wholly explain it. The system, as such, commended itself to the people, and has been growing in popularity ever since, until to-day the public school is in many instances preferred by persons who are abundantly able, and under other circumstances would be willing, to pay tuition in a private school in addition to their public-school tax.

So beneficent is the law, and so well regulated the system, that every child in the State, however poor, may secure an elementary education. To accommodate those who are obliged to work during the day, in many places night schools are established, the State thus affording every possible facility for the acquirement of secular knowledge.

Free public schools are found throughout the American

Union, all the States and territories now having superintendents of public instruction (some only since 1875) and an organized system of common schools. These various state systems agree in fundamentals, but differ somewhat in details, the position of the general government having always been that of fostering public education without assuming any direct control thereof. To Germany, Scotland, and some of the States of the American Union, belongs the honorable distinction of first putting into operation governmental schemes for general education. Other nations followed rapidly in their wake, and to-day national education, by means of free schools, prevails to a greater or less extent in all the civilized countries of the world.

As to the question of religion, all the common schools of the United States are what is called non-sectarian. In Pennsylvania, Article X. of the Constitution of 1873 makes it obligatory upon the Legislature to appropriate each year at least \$1,000,000 for the support of the common schools, and expressly prohibits the use of any of this money for the support of sectarian schools. The same position is substantially assumed in the other States. It has been powerfully assailed in some of them, more particularly by the Roman Catholic Church, which every where maintains parochial schools, and has made strenuous efforts to secure state appropriations for their support, but has totally failed in every instance, except in a few cities in the State of New York, among which is Poughkeepsie, where "a compromise has been effected between the common council and the representatives of the Catholic congregations, by means of which the parochial schools have been placed under the supervision of the city superintendent, and thus enabled to participate in the school fund of the city." Public opinion, however, throughout the entire Union is strongly in favor of carrying out the principle of undenominational education without any compromise whatever. This question was greatly agitated during the years 1874 and 1875, and was regarded as of sufficient national moment and interest at the

time to lead President Grant to recommend, in his message to Congress, December 7th, 1875, "that a Constitutional amendment be submitted to the legislatures of the several States for ratification, making it the duty of each of the several States to establish and forever maintain free public schools, adequate to the education of all the children in rudimentary branches, within their respective limits, irrespective of sex, color, birth-place, or religion; forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school fund or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal, or other authority, for the benefit or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination."

This recommendation was not acted upon, but it serves admirably to bring out in strong relief the position of the vast majority of the American people on this important question, viz., that the subject of religion is to remain untouched in our public schools.

Theoretically this is our position as a people, whilst practically, with but two exceptions, Cincinnati and Chicago, we are not nearly so radical. In explanation 154 of the Digest of the Common School Laws of Pennsylvania, 1876, we are told "the Scriptures come under the head of text-books, and they should not be omitted from the list," and it is the general custom, in the public schools of the State, to open the morning exercises by reading a passage from the Bible and offering a silent, or an audible prayer, which frequently is the Lord's Prayer. The school-books, too, are all written from the theistic standpoint, and whoever is familiar with our common schools will acknowledge that the atmosphere which pervades them is not wholly devoid of religion, and that in so far as it is religious it is christian rather than jewish, pagan or atheistic.

Neither is the Bible read only in the Pennsylvania schools. It is read in all the public schools of the Union except those of Cincinnati and Chicago, from which it was excluded in 1873.

in the case of the former, and in 1875 in the case of the latter, on the ground that it is unjust to require the children of Roman Catholics, Jews and non-christians to listen to the reading of a book in which they do not believe. This radical position demands that our public schools shall be not only non-sectarian, whilst they are, nevertheless, tacitly christian, but that they shall be utterly devoid of all religion. And such, it must be admitted, is the inevitable sequence of the non-sectarian theory when pushed to its logical conclusion.

In our discussion thus far we have not raised the question as to the comparative worth of the kind of education which the state furnishes, nor of its relative completeness. We have simply assumed that intellectual culture is desirable, and have given some of the facts connected with the history of such education in the United States, and more particularly in Pennsylvania. To further assume that this is the only kind of education necessary, is to take a position which has not by any means been proven. It is the only kind which the state directly recognizes, or has any power to supply, and rests on the theory that popular intelligence is the bulwark of free institutions, and that the diffusion of a knowledge of letters has a tendency to diminish crime and to foster man's nobler aspirations. "Ignorance," it has been argued, "unfits a man, to a considerable extent, for earning his daily bread, and in most cases, dooms him to abject poverty. The want of intellectual culture is, moreover, generally coupled with a lack of the feeling of self-respect and moral responsibility, thus leaving the poor victim an easy prey to the many temptations which society offers." It is also claimed that wherever a knowledge of letters is diffused among the people the ratio of the number of criminals to the whole population diminishes, and that in all countries the criminal class is mainly supplied from the ignorant class.

Under this theory, plausible as it seems to the superficial observer, there lurks a dangerous fallacy. It commits the blunder of taking a part for the whole, completely ignoring the fundamental truth that true education embraces the proper

training of man's entire nature, the training of the heart and the will as well as of the intellect. That intellectual culture is not sufficient by itself is clearly demonstrated by the fact that a cultivated mind is often found in persons who lack both a loving heart and a well trained will that freely chooses the right. As might be expected, therefore, when we come to examine statistics they fail to establish the claims which are made in favor of secular education. Fletcher, in *Summary of the Moral Statistics of England and Wales*, says, that "the comparison of the criminal and educational returns of England and other countries of Europe has afforded no sound statistical evidence in favor of, and as little against, the moral effects associated with instruction as actually disseminated among the people."* Herbert Spencer, in *Social Statics*, declares that "we have no evidence that education, as commonly understood, is a preventive of crime."* Alison, in the *History of Europe*, "boldly asserts the whole doctrine to be a fallacy, and presents statistics to prove that crimes are more numerous where education, that is, what is usually considered education, is diffused." "Experience," he says, "has now abundantly verified the melancholy truth, that intellectual cultivation has no effect in arresting the sources of evil in the human heart, that it alters the direction of crime, but does not alter its amount."*

These are indeed said to be extreme views. But why? Mainly, if not altogether, because it is too humiliating to accept them. It is too much of a reflection on the boasted civilization of the nineteenth century. Facts, however, as well as a true conception of the natural condition of the human heart, compel us to acknowledge them. But in admitting them are we forced to give up the problem? By no means. We are only put into a position to properly appreciate it, because we are thereby made to feel more keenly than ever that the state is not the only institution which has a duty to perform in the solution of the educational question.

The family and the church are divine institutions too, and

* *Cyclopædia of Education*: Kiddle & Schem, Page 194.

they both antedate the state. We find them in Paradise when man was in his primeval condition, and they have followed him all along his history more closely than the civil power, and have a function to perform in the education of our children which far transcends that of the state. We were sons and daughters before we were citizens, and shall be children of God when we cease to be citizens.

The complete and proper education of the young can be effected only through the co-operation of the family, the church and the state. These institutions are all of divine origin. They each have their part to perform, and each one constitutes an important factor in all true education, which must recognize the important truth that we owe duties to ourselves and our children, to our fellow-men, and to God. This gives us the idea of the family, the state and the church. As our first and highest duties are those which we owe to God, the preponderating influence should be exerted by the church, but the church even dare not arrogate to itself the exclusive privilege of educating the young, since we must learn how to be good citizens, as well as how to be good church members. A purely ecclesiastical education would be one-sided and therefore defective. The state has also its rights and obligations, and it is under this view that we defend its activity in furnishing means for the education of the rising generation.

If secular education is incomplete and defective does that say that it is necessarily and only evil? It furnishes some of the means requisite for the training of children; means that must be employed whether it be an ecclesiastical, civil, or private family school in which the children are placed. In the school-room they acquire a knowledge of letters, which, we admit, is not education, but it certainly is a necessary part of all education, whether true or false. As far as their religious training is concerned it does not make much difference whether the church catechism be taught or not. The mere presence of the catechism will not satisfy the spiritual wants of the children and make the schools a positively christian power, as has been

so sadly demonstrated by the public schools of Prussia. "We look to the wrong place," it has been well said, "when we entrust this operation" (the implanting and development of religious truth) "to the ordinary school-master. The parent, the church, the individual's self, the spirit of the age as shown in general society and in literature—combine to insure the presence or the absence of the religious tone of mind." The common notion that children are educated only in the school room is a mistake. The child spends at most only five or six hours, out of the twenty-four in the school room, five days in the week during the school term. But the formation of its character, which is the thing chiefly to be considered, is going forward all the time.

To say that the common schools are godless, because there is no provision for formal instruction in christian doctrine in these schools, is about as true as if we were to say that the carpenter trade is a godless business, because masters do not teach their apprentices anything in regard to their religious duties. The master sets a good or a bad example, and surrounds himself with a religious or an irreligious atmosphere, but that is about all he can do. The church itself has made it impossible for the state to do any more. It is so jealous that none of its funds shall be appropriated for the use of sectarian or denominational schools, not because it is the enemy of the church, or of Christianity, but because such appropriations would at once arouse the animosity of the well nigh innumerable sects with which the land is cursed, and thus produce endless confusion. The state is not the enemy, but the friend of the church, exempting all houses of worship from taxation, making laws to improve the religious observance of the Lord's day, and showing its respect for, and sense of obligation to, the church in other ways. We are a christian nation, not only nominally but really. That is to say, the ideas and sentiments which have the controlling force in fashioning the laws of the state are christian, not pagan or atheistic. The church of Jesus Christ, torn and mangled though it be, is inwoven with the very life of the peo-

ple, and the state cannot afford to do otherwise than protect and encourage the church within her own sphere.

This is an age of intense intellectual activity, and the nation that does not foster intellectual culture will inevitably fall behind in the onward march of civilization and enlightenment. The state realizes this and is doing all it can to further the education of the masses. Is the church doing as much? We think not. She does not seem to have as yet properly awakened to the importance of her work in this direction. The state has not taken the education of our children out of her hands. With the church it repudiates the great Spartan maxim, ascribed to Lycurgus; "Children belong to the state, their education ought to be directed by the state, and the views and interests of the state ought in it alone to be considered." Our civil government does not claim that the citizen is for it, but confesses that it is for the citizen. Ours is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. All that the state claims is that ignorance retards, and popular intelligence advances the interests of the people. The church realizes that more than intellectual culture is necessary. Let her see to it therefore that the deficiency be made up by proper training in the family and the congregation.

But can the deficiency be supplied in this way? Undoubtedly. The first christians had no literary institutions of their own, and consequently their children were in many instances sent to pagan schools, and yet they did not thereby become pagans, but grew up as christians, because the church and the family were real powers for good in those days.

Educational religion must always be largely family religion if its true purpose is to be attained. What the mother is to her child's natural life, its medium source and its sustenance, that must the church be to the spiritual life of the child, and mainly through the instrumentality of the parents. The child has no spiritual life by nature, but it has a strong susceptibility for it. Though conceived and born in sin, it is not hardened in sin. It is a proper subject for the kingdom of grace. But who, except parents, will heed the gracious invitation of the Saviour;

"Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God?" Parents must bring their little ones and lay them into the arms of Jesus, through the Holy Sacrament of Baptism. Born again of water and the Spirit there is room for christian nurture. Upon this foundation, sacramental union with Jesus Christ, christian character can be reared as a superstructure, but it requires great care, watchfulness and prayer. And the good work cannot be too soon commenced, because early childhood is the time when deep and lasting impressions are made. If, in this tender age, the good seed is constantly sown, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, watered with the tears and hallowed with the never intermitting prayers of loving, self-sacrificing parents, principles are implanted that remain in after life, and a bent of soul is accomplished which in subsequent years is not altered, but only matured and perfected. There is a profound philosophy, verified continually in every-day life, in the Scriptural injunction, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Such training is not "interfering with nature," as Rousseau, and many others since his time, would have us believe, any more than planting a little sapling into good soil, and furnishing it with support to keep it from growing crooked, is interfering with nature. The mother, who brings all the divine grace to bear upon the soul of her child that she possibly can, "assists nature" in the deepest and truest sense in which such a thing is possible, because the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is just what fallen human nature needs to attain perfection. Let christian mothers take courage and labor boldly on. Their work is more important than many of them realize. A young man of keen intellect, scholarly attainments and independence of thought, at the time a student, just finishing his course at Yale, said, in the presence of the writer, "When I have been grappling for months with the perplexing problems of Natural Science and Metaphysics, and have seen how these studies have

a peculiar something in them which opens and paves the way to skepticism, because it is so much easier to accept half truths than to grasp the whole truth, it is a relief to come home to my mother, and I dread more every time I go away to get beyond the circle of her influence." That mother is only a plain woman who knows no science, but she does know her Saviour, and has nurtured her children in the chastening and admonition of the Lord.

Where there is Christian nurture like this in the family, the child can attend the public school, to be drilled in elementary knowledge, with but little danger of having his religious training either vitiated or neutralized, although family instruction even like this is not sufficient in itself. The mother above referred to did not only teach her children at home, but she brought them up in the church. The Sunday-school, the catechetical class, the prayer meeting, the stated services of the sanctuary, and the direct pastoral oversight of the minister are all agencies which parents need for the christian training of their children. They cannot shift their responsibility to these institutions, or delegate their work to them, but these are their allies, and through their instrumentality parents are enabled to nurture their children in the Lord.

It has often seemed a remarkable Providence to the writer that the Sunday-school sprang up side by side with the public school; that their origin and growth as national institutions were simultaneous, giving the church an opportunity to attend more directly to the spiritual wants of children than she otherwise could. For certainly it must be acknowledged by all, that the Sunday-school is a great power in modern Protestant Christianity, not only because of the instruction which is directly imparted, but also through the hymns which the children learn, and by means of which they imbibe christian sentiments. True we hear again and again, from different quarters, that the Sunday-school is not accomplishing the purpose for which it is intended; because in many instances children are educated, through its instrumentality, away from, rather than to the

church. This is not the fault of the institution as such, but of those who conduct the schools, which are, of course, just what we make them. If we give them into the hands of irresponsible persons for superintendence, the underlying spirit of their anomalous position will necessarily affect teachers and scholars. Let the minister be the pastor of the Sunday-school, and let him first of all himself fully realize that he is, as well as of the congregation, and uphold the necessity of a public profession of faith and church membership, in his ministrations in the school in the same way in which he does when he stands before his congregation, and the Sunday-school will not educate the young away from the church.

By-the-way how will our friends explain what seems to us to be a strange inconsistency? They persist in upholding the necessity of parochial schools in which the church catechism and a system of positive christian doctrine shall be taught, when at the same time the catechism is not found in most Sunday-schools, even in denominations that lay great stress on educational religion. The majority of these schools simply use the "International Scripture Lessons," and in many instances the only "Quarterlies" seen by teachers and scholars are those of a "non-sectarian," and therefore of course irresponsible, but nevertheless highly enterprising firm in Chicago, that is making every effort to secure a monopoly of the business by preparing comments that will suit everybody.

The Sunday-school needs a deeper apprehension of the nature of its work, and a better appreciation of its opportunities. There is too much ill-directed activity. We need more systematic teaching, as well as a more intelligent use of the means at hand if the end in view is to be satisfactorily attained.

It is sometimes said that the teachers in our public schools can neutralize or even vitiate, in the five or six hours during which they daily have the children under their care, all that christian parents, the church and Sunday-school are able by their united efforts to accomplish. Probably they can if such be their deliberate and studied endeavor. But is it not doing

these teachers great injustice to assume that, as a rule, they are skeptics? That some of them are, we do not deny, but certainly the number which belongs to this class is small, and they cannot usually remain long enough in any one community to do much harm. As a general thing the teachers in our public schools are faithful members of the church, and do their work as much in the fear of the Lord as any other class of persons.

The education of children is a complex process involving many factors, and so long as we remember that instruction in the public schools is only one of them we need not be afraid of these schools. Because of the divided state of the church there can be no formal religious teaching in them. The church must see to it therefore that instruction in the doctrines and duties of our holy religion be not omitted, but imparted elsewhere, and the public schools must be recognized in their true character, that is, as a secular institution,—an institution that belongs to the state, which has to do with this world and with this life only. Civil government makes no provision for the life to come. Its work ends at the grave of its citizens, as the things of this world, and of this life necessarily must. Let it be universally recognized that precisely this is the position which the so-called non-sectarian schools of the state necessarily occupy, and it will also be felt that the church and the family must put into vigorous exercise all possible forms of christian activity that will best promote the advancement of Christ's kingdom among the people.

In taking this position we have not overlooked the fundamental truth that religion and daily life cannot be divorced, but that the former must be carried into the latter, and permeate all our secular activities if these are to come up to the demands of Christianity. We have not forgotten the exhortation of the Apostle; “Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.” This injunction whilst, in a certain sense, it has a profound meaning for institutions and systems as such is, nevertheless, to rest more particularly upon the hearts and consciences of individuals, and in

this way applies with great force to the teachers in our public schools. If they dare not make any comments on what is read from the Bible, nor teach any particular system of religious doctrine, it is nevertheless their duty to do all their work to the glory of God by letting their light shine, and unfolding themselves as living epistles of Jesus Christ before their pupils. Just as all the text books are written from the theistic standpoint, so have christian nations and christian communities the right to demand that all the teaching shall proceed from the same standpoint. And if unworthy or skeptical teachers find their way into our schools it is the duty of the directors, who are the servants of the people and therefore under obligations to consult their wishes, to see to the removal of such instructors.

Thus far we have been considering the common school system in its ordinary field of operation in furnishing the children of any given locality, whether rural or municipal, with the advantages of an elementary education. There is in these cases no community life such as we find in boarding schools, colleges and all the higher institutions of learning. The pupils are all "day scholars." We believe that the common school system ought to be confined, very nearly, if not altogether, to this field. We are utterly at a loss to see how it can properly supply the wants of higher education, or of the community life which necessarily exists in a boarding school. Such schools need more than a chapel in which the students gather to sing, to hear the Bible read, and to engage in silent prayer. The students of such institutions are taken away from their families and their church homes. These important educational factors cannot be ignored. They must be provided for in the school itself, or remain unsupplied. But the common school system has no provision, and can have none for the religious wants of the students that are gathered together in a boarding school. Normal schools seem to be a necessity. A minister of the Gospel as Principal may do much, without violating the spirit of the law, to supply the wants referred to, but unfortunately the Principals

of most of these schools are not ministers, but laymen. The majority of these men speak respectfully of Christianity, but fail utterly to make it the ruling principle of their thinking and teaching. Some of them satisfy themselves with sentimental remarks, on special occasions, about heaven and children lisp- ing prayers at a mother's knee. It is our firm conviction that the sphere of operation in the case of these schools should be restricted to their avowed purpose, viz.; the instruction of young people in the theory and practice of teaching. They ought not to dream of competing with colleges, and God save this Commonwealth from anything like a State University!

May we not believe that there is a Providence in this too, that our higher institutions of learning are nearly all denominational? The colleges which are exerting the greatest influence are those which are carried forward under the auspices and loving care of some branch of the church of Jesus Christ. That this should be the case has perhaps never yet been properly appreciated, nor has this phase of the educational problem received the attention which it deserves.

The most important periods in the education of young persons are early childhood, and early manhood and womanhood; the time of first impressions and the time of youthful maturity. For just as the impressions of early childhood are the most lasting, so also is the period when the reflective powers of the mind are first fully awakened the season which is most prominent in shaping the after course of a man's or a woman's life. It is at this time that the youthful mind must learn to plant itself on solid ground by finding the true stand-point of obser- vation, as it gazes with burning enthusiasm over the vast field of human knowledge. Just then it imperatively needs the divine light of a Christological system of philosophy to illumine its on- ward path. This can be furnished only by a literary institution which firmly grasps the eternal verities of the Gospel, and teaches Christianity to be an objective constitution of supernatural grace in the world, demanding universal, but free and intelligent obe- dience. In other words it can be done only by a college or uni-

versity that is under the direct care of some branch of the Christian church, and therefore responsible, not to the secular power, but to the church, and thus to its Head, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, *the Way, the Truth, and the Life.*

The educational problem is, at present, involved in more than ordinary difficulties. This is owing mainly to the unsettled condition of the intellectual world, and to the fact that we are passing through a transition period. The old landmarks are giving way. In all the departments of human knowledge every thing is questioned, and new theories are springing up in all directions, eagerly crying for acceptance. The idea of a liberal education, in the good old sense, is vigorously fought against. Young men, it is claimed, must have a "useful education." They need not study Latin and Greek. They can *read translations*, Mr. Bain tells us, of the *Classics*, and in this way learn all that is of value in those old authors so long off the stage of action. The utilitarian dominates so completely in this author's mind that his "Renovated Curriculum" almost reminds one of a Mercantile College. And yet this man is an authority on the question of education to-day. From his own standpoint he discusses the whole subject quite thoroughly in *Education as a Science*, but, whilst he says many things that are worth remembering, he fails, in most instances, to carry conviction to the minds of his readers, because the arguments upon which he rests his positions are unsatisfactory and inconclusive.

A more profound and original thinker than Bain has furnished him with the fundamental principles upon which the educational theory rests which makes so much of science, and pushes into the back-ground, or utterly ignores, the old idea of liberal culture for its own sake. This man is Herbert Spencer, called by Mr. Darwin, "Our great philosopher." Mr. Spencer is at once the product and the inspiration of the scientific discoveries which have been made since the middle of the present century. Before Mr. Darwin had published a word on the subject, Mr. Spencer had conceived of "evolution as a universal law, and as the basis of a new philosophy." He has applied this theory to

every department of knowledge, giving to the world a detailed reconstruction of biological, psychological, sociological, pedagogic and ethical science. In his book, *Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical*, so admirable in style, so forcible and happy in illustration, so conclusive in argument, so profoundly true to nature, so fair and candid, the heart of the reader warms to the author, and one is tempted to forget the insidious agnostic philosophy that pervades its every page. No wonder that this book is read, not only by teachers generally in England and the United States, but has also been rendered into the principal languages of Europe, and is well known by complete or partial reproduction in India, China and Japan, and that a portion of it has even been translated into modern Greek, but how sad to think that it has no room for a personal God, and knows nothing of sin as an offence against Him, or of the life to come!

“To prepare us for complete living” Mr. Spencer correctly maintains, “is the function which education has to discharge.” But when he comes to classify the elements which enter into such a course of training he knows only of “that education which prepares for direct self-preservation ; that which prepares for indirect self-preservation ; that which prepares for parenthood ; that which prepares for citizenship ; that which prepares for the miscellaneous refinements of life.” In this classification, as the reader will perceive, utilitarian and secular ideas alone find place, man’s spiritual nature being entirely overlooked. “Complete living” is regarded as though it were in no way related to a personal Deity, but as if it were possible by simply following Nature, and having one’s powers developed according to her laws. Self-preservation is upheld as of primary importance, whilst the higher law of self-sacrifice, and surrender to Him who made us for Himself is overlooked. It is forgotten too that love is the fulfilling of the deepest of all laws, and not the love of self, but of others. God Himself is love, and the essence of His love, is His will and power to give. Created in His image, complete living is possible for man, only when he recognizes, first of all, the relation which

he sustains to his Maker and Redeemer, and surrenders himself to Him with all his heart, and loves his neighbor as himself.

At the close of the chapter on Moral Education, Mr. Spencer says, "It will be seen that we have said nothing about the transcendental distinction between right and wrong, of which wise men know so little, and children nothing. . . . Nor have we introduced the religious element. We have confined our inquiries to a nearer, and a much more neglected field, though a very important one. Our readers may supplement our thoughts in any way they please; we are only concerned that they should be accepted as far as they go."

To attempt to discuss moral education without introducing "the religious element;" that is, without taking into consideration the existence of God, and the duties which we owe to Him, and without admitting that any of our ethical ideas are in any way derived from Him, is like discussing the science of colors, but using only artificial light in examining them. Such a work could not be supplemented, but would be radically defective, throughout, because it is only in the light of the sun that colors are properly brought out, and thus capable of thorough examination. In the same way it is only in the light of the Sun of Righteousness that our moral ideas assume definite and distinct outlines and thus are capable of anything like a searching investigation.

We have dealt in detail with this book, because however profound, original and independent many of his followers may be, the speculative mind of the new school of science is still Herbert Spencer, and if we can see through his fallacies, we will also be able to discern those of his disciples. These men, with Mr. Spencer at their head, are performing an important work in the sphere of philosophy and science, in enlarging our views of the universe, and the method of its production, but they are also committing a serious blunder. They forget that however wide the field may be which is covered by the logical understanding and empirical science, there is another field open to the human soul, which these can neither discover nor enter.

This other field embraces the things of the Spirit, which can only be spiritually discerned. "No doubt science and philosophy," says Principal Shairp in *Culture and Religion*, than which we know of no better antidote for Spencer, Bain, and the rest, "have something to do with shaping the intellectual forms in which spiritual truths shall be expressed. But when criticism pretends to penetrate into the inner essence of spiritual truths, and to supply us with modern equivalents for them, it is then time to remind it that it is overstepping the limits which are proper to it. For it is to the spirit and conscience of men that spiritual truth makes its appeal, and by these in the last resort it must be apprehended."

Education, to be true, in the university, the college, and the public schools must recognize the existence both of nature and the supernatural, and properly acknowledge the legitimate claims of each. It is no doubt difficult to hold these two in right relation to each other, but just this is the mission of Christian education. The key to the solution of the problem is the Person of Jesus Christ. In Him the natural and the spiritual worlds flow together and perfectly harmonize, since He is at once their author and highest product—the Godman. It is highly important, therefore, to remember that what we need is not simply the theistic, but the Christo-theistic standpoint from which to survey truth in every department of human learning. For just as Jesus Christ is, in His own Person, the centre from which revelation and redemption have come forth, so is He also the centre from which philosophical and scientific thought must be unfolded. The Christological idea properly wrought out alone can remove the conflict between science and religion, as well as between secular and religious training.

COLUMBIA, PA.

ART. VI.—THE DOMINION OF CHRIST.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M.

OUR Lord Jesus bears the honorable title of "Prince of Peace"; and, in allusion to His sacerdotal office and functions, as connected with this royalty, He is described also as a "priest upon his throne." While, therefore, Christ is pre-eminently known and honored as Redeemer of the world, He is also the King of Saints. This particular phase of our Lord's character we shall now proceed to illustrate. Our remarks will be based on the magnificent description which the Apostle gives us of the Son of God and Son of Mary, in the opening sentences of his Epistle to the Hebrews—a piece of writing distinguished as much for the classic purity of its style as for the sublimity of its conceptions and the transcendent beauty and simplicity of its portraiture.

The writer of the Epistle introduces the blessed angels, as among the most eminent of God's creatures, in order to exhibit, by way of contrast, the sublime virtues and supernatural character of the Son of God. They are indeed recognized as ministering spirits in the new kingdom of the Messiah which was about to be established in the earth—as messengers employed in an honorable cause, but only to their exalted Prince Himself is it said: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." The immediate subject of these remarkable words is the throne of its Christ, or His mediatorial kingdom—its *perpetuity* and *equity*. These ideas are both equally based on the Divine character of Jesus—on His essential Deity. The representation is evidently

designed by the Apostle to establish and confirm the Hebrew converts in their faith and attachment to the gospel of Christ. The writer was probably induced to adopt this course by the fact that these proselytes from Judaism were strongly tempted to forsake the Christian faith and worship, in consequence of its extreme simplicity and freedom from external pomp and parade, and to return to Judaism, so venerable in point of age, and so attractive by reason of its splendid and imposing ritual and of its gorgeous ceremonial worship. The danger was great and pressing; and, in order effectually to counteract and check this dangerous tendency, the Apostle exhibits the chief points of excellence in the Christian system of doctrine and worship and their superiority over the contents of the ancient ritual, or Jewish system of worship; especially does he set forth the unapproachable pre-eminence of Christ—the Mediator of the New Covenant—over Moses and the blessed Angels, by whose intervention the ancient system had been established. Here, as already intimated, he brings to our notice the supreme power and dominion of Christ or His mediatorial government—the *throne* being the symbol, universally, of such power and dominion. In setting forth the dominion or reign of Christ, we notice in the first place its *Perpetuity*—“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” These words effectually prove and establish beyond a question this particular phase in the reign of our Lord. They attribute to the throne of Christ an eternal, changeless, and abiding character—enduring to the “ages of ages.”

That Christ should possess a throne and exercise dominion or spiritual power and authority over the world, results necessarily from the fact of His mediatorship. This high office and its dread prerogatives belong to Christ already as the Son of Man; “for there is one God,” we are told, “and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.” It was in consequence of His infinite condescension, in becoming man and passing through all the experiences of man, that God so highly exalted Him at His own right hand. And, as the throne which He oc-

cupies as the Son of Man, is also the throne of God, the power which He wields, is infinite in extent and perpetual in duration. This peculiar phase of our Lord's dominion rests mainly on the Person of Christ—*His essential Deity*. “Thy throne, *O God*, is for ever and ever.” It is the throne of a Divine-human Person—not simply of man. The eternity of the Sovereign easily suggests, and, in fact, essentially requires the eternity of His throne—the perpetuity of His kingdom—the permanence of His government. Nothing short of this would meet the requirements of the case. Every other view of Christ's mediatorial throne—placing it upon a lower basis—would be absolutely inconsistent with the character of the ruler. He is “King of Kings, and Lord of Lords;” and, as such, needs both a universal kingdom, and a Divine perpetually enduring power and dominion. This was distinctly seen and felt already by the Old Testament prophets, and by them variously represented in their predictions relative to His coming glory. David, in one of his inimitable compositions, celebrates the transcendent glory of his illustrious successor upon the throne of Israel in these sublime and touching strains: “I will extol thee, my God, *O King*; I will bless thy name for ever and ever. All thy works shall praise Thee, *O Lord*, and thy saints shall bless thee. They shall speak of the glory of thy kingdom, and talk of thy power; to make known to the sons of men his mighty acts and the glorious majesty of his kingdom. Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.” How beautiful—how touching—how appropriate and elevating these sentiments of the royal Psalmist! How well adapted to awaken the same lofty sentiments, which he himself felt, in the bosom of others; a most appropriate tribute this to the blessed Son of God—the King of saints. It is, however, in no respect different from what we find in all the ancient prophets. Listen to the sublime strains in which Isaiah, the prince of sacred bards, celebrates the coming of the Lord—the glory of the Prince of Peace. “Unto us a child is born—to us a son is given; the govern-

ment shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor—the Mighty God—the everlasting Father—the Prince of Peace; of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and for ever.' So far Isaiah—beholding in vision the very things asserted by St. Paul. The illustrious Prince, whom he beheld looming up before him in the distant future, was at once human and divine—a child of earth, a son given, and yet "the Mighty God—the everlasting Father." And then upon the strength of this wonderful character, is predicted the equally singular fact of His dominion—a reign merited, universal, and perpetual. In the same way also speaks the prophet Daniel, whose language in some respects is still more strikingly characteristic. He places the great "Prince of his people" along side of earthly princes—His everlasting kingdom in contrast with their weak and ephemeral reigns—the origin, gradual increase, final triumph, and matchless glory of His realm, in broad and prominent contrast with the origin, pretensions, momentary splendor, and final decay, failure, and irretrievable ruin of earthly states, kingdoms, and empires. In one of his splendid visions the prophet saw, as in a picture, the entire succession of governing powers in the world, and Christ as the legitimate inheritor of them all. Let us attend to his sublime and touching language in reference to this point. "I saw in the night-vision, and, behold, one like unto the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days; and they brought him near before Him; and there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the people, nations, and languages should serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Such is the representation of Daniel, or rather the vision vouchsafed to him, respecting the universal extent and perpetual continuance of Christ's kingdom; and here, again, we

see how carefully this "everlasting dominion" is based on the Divine character of the Sovereign, who holds this extensive power, and wields it for the good of His saints. The supreme monarch is "like the Son of Man;" but not this only—He is also the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world. On the strength of these prophetic images and representations, the Jews very properly expected the establishment of an endless dominion in the near future, and thought that, when the Messiah came, He would continue for ever. Their expectations were essentially correct, only they understood the matter carnally and not spiritually as they ought to have done.

The royalty of Jesus and His authority to rule, as head of the church, rests also on the express *promise of the Father*, and on the extraordinary gifts and graces bestowed on Him in view of this promise. This fact comes out strikingly in the declaration of our Saviour Himself, when He says: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." As Mediator of the New Covenant and Redeemer of the world, He absolutely needed such extensive power and authority—a universal dominion. And this needed power the Father accordingly gave Him—gave it to Him, as already intimated, in consequence of His infinite condescension. It was because the blessed Redeemer, "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and, being found in fashion as a man, He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;"—it was, because He did and suffered all this, that "God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This magnificent passage of St. Paul is in full and exact accordance with the corresponding Old Testament prophecies and promises respecting the Messiah and His everlasting dominion

—His regal power and authority. “I have made a covenant with my chosen,” saith the Lord, “I have sworn unto David my servant; thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations.”—“Also I will make Him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth; my mercy will I keep for Him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with Him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and His *throne* as the days of heaven.”—“My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and His throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.” This sublime description, virtually and as to substance, is applied by the angel to our Saviour, in the following words: “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of his father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end.”

Such and so abundant are the sublime and definite predictions of the ancient prophets concerning Christ and His mediatorial reign or dominion over the saints. When once “the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High,” then shall the blessed reign of the Messiah be fully inaugurated and its legitimate fruits enjoyed. “In His days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace, so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion, also, from sea to sea, and from the river even unto the ends of the earth.” Thus established as king upon Mt. Zion, “the heathen shall be given Him for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession.” O what dignity—power—dominion, vested in Him who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords! A diadem of glory adorns the manly brow of our Prince—Immanuel!

The mediatorial reign of Christ, with His dominion over the

saints, results also from the *redeeming and sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost*. The Divine Spirit, as Paraclete or Comforter, is the purchase of Christ's blood, the author of faith in the human heart—the supernatural power, that awakens, renews, and sanctifies the souls of the redeemed, and thus unites them into the one body mystical—of which Christ is the ever-living and glorious Head. “For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.” Into this blessed union with Christ and with each other we are brought by the Spirit, in accordance with the order of Divine grace—the ordinances of God's house. “For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one spirit.” Of this spiritual body, as already intimated, Christ is the ever-living Head, so intimately united with each member in particular, and with the whole body collectively, that this inner bond of union can never be broken, nor its cords weakened, except where sin is voluntarily yielded to and cherished by the subject. Jesus Christ stands related to His church, not simply as a king to his subjects, a husband to his bride, or a father to his family; but, also, as the Head to the body. So intimate and vital is this relation, so peculiar in its nature, that the severance of the union would be alike fatal both to the Head and the body mystical, as well as to every single member in particular. “I am the vine,” says Jesus, “ye are the branches; as the branch cannot bear fruit except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye, except ye abide in me.” And it is reasonable to suppose that a violent disruption of the Church from Jesus Christ would be equally damaging to Him, as Mediator of the New Covenant and *Head* of the Church, “which is His body, the *fulness* of Him that filleth all in all.” Christ, as the God-Man, the Second Adam and “Lord from heaven,” has His life inseparably bound up with that of His people. And just as the branches in the vine or tree grow forth from the trunk, and thenceforth become essential parts of

the true organs for the healthy action of its life and highly necessary to its legitimate growth, and thus in a certain sense also necessary to its very existence as a vine or tree; so the Church, organically subsisting in its different members, is the body of Christ—"the *fulness* of Him that filleth all in all." Have you ever duly considered the import of this language—its force and meaning? Does it not clearly intimate that the Church—the mystical body of Christ—is necessary to His perfection, His completeness as Mediator? He is Head of the body only as He is vitally linked to the same, in the several members which constitute the body—He is the Father of His spiritual family only as He stands at the head of the same, livingly joined to His children, and by them tenderly loved and obeyed—He is king of saints only in so far as He is surrounded by and spiritually linked to His recognized subjects. In short, the Redeemer, in order to meet and fill out the terms of His office as Mediator and Head of the Church, must have a family of spiritual children, a company of saints, a number of moral subjects, over whom He presides and for whom He mediates.

Now inasmuch as Jesus came into the world expressly to redeem men, and as "God gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church;" so the Holy Ghost, taking the place of the ascended Saviour, by His regenerating power and influence, gathers, defends, and preserves the Church in everlasting union and fellowship with her Divine Lord and Master. Jesus Himself is constituted a "Priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck;" and, as such, He has entered into the heavenly sanctuary, "where He ever liveth to make intercession for the saints, according to the will of God." Nor is our Lord's regal and prophetic office less permanent and abiding. He is ever actively engaged in the unseen and eternal world, even as He was ever active here, guarding, guiding and governing His saints. And this divine guardianship in behalf of His people, will continue for ever—securing them in their blessed inheritance among the saints in light. "For the Lamb, which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them—with the bread of life—and lead them

unto living fountains of water; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Such is the close and endearing relation sustained by our Lord Jesus Christ to His blood-bought Church, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

Our remarks thus far have been designed to illustrate the *perpetuity* of Christ's throne or dominion—its permanence or endless duration. We now pass on to notice its *Equity*. "A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." These words sufficiently indicate the righteous character of the Mediatorial government—the throne of Christ. The sceptre which He wields is emphatically a sceptre of *righteousness*, of justice.

The dominion of Christ, in the first place, is *founded* in right or justice. It is not a wicked usurpation. The Redeemer came to it in the way of law and order—not by arbitrary power or policy—and He holds it by covenant right. Indeed as the only begotten Son of God and "heir of all things," the Saviour would have been already by virtue of His nature entitled to the throne of the universe, and by inference, also to the headship of the Church. It is by and through Him, "who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person," that the Father governs all things. On this original and universal ground, then, we might safely rest the Redeemer's claim to the dominion of the world; but, in the present case, we base the authority of Christ upon an entirely different ground. We are not now discussing the original and universal dominion of Christ, over the world, which belongs to Him as the Son of God. Our present concern is with the mediatorial government of Jesus, as the Son of Man—the Saviour of the world. This is something separate and distinct from the governing power which belongs to Him as the uncreated Word, and which He always possessed in connection with the Father—even "the glory which He had with Him before the world was." Such was the original, essential, and inalienable glory of Christ as the eternal Son; but He had, besides this,

another glory, power, and dominion, which, we claim, was given to Him—the incarnate one—as the merited purchase of His blood, and is now possessed and exercised by Him as the slain, risen, and exalted Redeemer—the Mediator of the New Covenant. In the second Psalm, which speaks of an extensive combination of the kings and rulers of the earth against the Lord and His anointed, we have the following language from the lips of the Messiah Himself: “I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession. Here a strictly universal dominion over the earth and its inhabitants is guarantied to the Son of God. In virtue of His covenant relation and engagements, He has a *right* to claim all that is there mentioned. He has an undoubted claim to the nations, whom He proposed to redeem, even to the uttermost parts of the earth. It is concerning Him, whom we adore as king of saints, that the prophet of God says: “He shall be a Father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. And the key of the house of David will I lay upon His shoulders; so He shall open and none shall shut, and He shall shut and none shall open.” This passage, in substance, the Saviour applies directly to Himself, and that with a view of comforting His saints. “Fear not,” says He, “I am the first and the last. I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I live forevermore—Amen; and I have the keys of death and hell.”

In exact accordance with these Old Testament citations—sanctioned by Christ and His apostles—it is asserted in immediate connection with the passage on which our remarks are chiefly based, that because the Messiah loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore, God, His God, had “anointed Him with the oil of gladness above His fellows”—in power—whether they be men or angels. For, in view of His perfect obedience, “God raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and

power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church—which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." And on what ground is this glory of Christ based? In His Epistle to the Philippians, the Apostle tells us, that, *because* "Christ humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore, God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name, which is above every name, that, at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

The dominion of Christ, as being a righteous dominion, essentially *stands in right*, and, thus, fosters and maintains the right. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Jesus saves from sin, and reigns over the multitudes of the redeemed—those saved from the powers of evil. "A sceptre of *righteousness* is the sceptre of thy kingdom." Not only did Christ, our great High Priest, prophet, and king, come to His dominion in a righteous and legitimate way, but the sceptre which He sways is a righteous sceptre—the power which He wields is a righteous power—the government which He exercises is a righteous or spiritual government—*essentially* right, and so adapted to awaken and foster right, and justice, and purity, in the blessed subjects of this government. The Messiah's kingdom is a "kingdom of heaven" upon the earth, and its rule is the same as that which obtains among the pure and blessed inhabitants of the heavenly kingdom. The dominion of Christ over and among His saints could not possibly be otherwise than just or righteous, because He is Himself the "holy one and the just." Hence the Psalmist very beautifully says that "justice and judgment are the habitation of His throne;" and, that "His foundation is in the holy mountains."

All these expressions are designed to represent the essential purity, the justice, and the righteousness of the mediatorial government of Christ. Its very nature, and the foundation upon which it rests, as well as the manner of its administration, all conspire to assert and claim for it the character of equity—a “sceptre of righteousness.” Upon the character of the sovereign depends universally the character of the government over which he presides. From the known wicked character of the tyrant, we naturally infer the tyrannical and oppressive nature of his reign; and so likewise on the recognized virtue and justice of a Prince we predicate the superior excellence and equity of his sway. Shall we not then also predicate the righteousness and essentially moral aspect of Christ’s government of the world, from the fact of His super-human excellence, His immaculate purity and grace—from the fact of His being “the Holy one and the just”—“the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of His person?”

It is equally clear that so pure and excellent a government as the Messiah’s—a purely spiritual government—must likewise awaken and foster the same kind of pure moral or religious sentiment and feeling in the hearts and in the lives of its subjects. It is the nature of things, their necessary and inevitable tendency, that like should produce like. On this universal principle or tendency of things, both natural and spiritual, rests the entire fabric of religious or moral training and the higher spiritual culture, whether in the family or in the church. Even in purely secular things this rule holds good. The viciousness of any system, whether in philosophy or religion, or even in the sphere of politics, is a sure and inevitable presage of vice and immorality in those who come within its range. The cruel oppressions of a tyrant awaken the spirit of dissatisfaction, of hatred, of resistance, and of revenge in the unfortunate and down-trodden populace. Exactly the contrary spirit is awakened and cherished by the just and equitable administration of any government, human or divine. And on the basis of this universally operative and potent element in our common human

nature, we assert that the mild and merciful sway of our Immanuel—Jesus—cannot but produce the most salutary effects on the hearts and lives of those who are the happy subjects of His kingdom. The religion of Christ is essentially elevating, refining, and sanctifying. The spiritual reign of Christ, especially in the hearts of His loving and obedient subjects, is saving in its influence on the life and character of men. It is in view of this fact that David says: “Surely His salvation is nigh them that fear Him; that glory may dwell in our land. Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other; truth shall spring out of the earth; and righteousness shall look down from heaven. Yea, the Lord shall give that which is good; and our land shall yield her increase. Righteousness shall go before Him, and shall set us in the way of His steps.”

So powerfully and effectively does the influence of the presence and exercise of the Redeemer’s gracious reign among men operate on their moral character. Man is, in fact, created and constitutionally adapted for impressions from without. Everything beneath, and above, and around him serves to mould his character, and to give shape and coloring to his inner life. Among the children of the same household a striking and characteristic family likeness is generally discernible; and the reason is not simply because they are co-natural, but also because they are reared, trained, and fashioned under similar influences and relations or outward circumstances. The family life, in its peculiar phases, often is re-produced in each individual member of the household. So in the kingdom of Christ. Here, also, everything is moulding and shaping the character and destiny of God’s children. “We all, with open face beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.” To this inward similarity or spiritual conformity with the Lord, as well as to a sweet and cheerful acquiescence in His will and ways, the mildness and benignity of the Saviour’s reign naturally incline us. “The love of Christ constraineth

us," says the Apostle; "for we thus judge, that, if one died for all, then were all dead, and that He died for all, that they who live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him that died and rose again." Such love—so pure and elevated—so free and disinterested—so boundless and overwhelming, as that of Jesus, cannot but constrain us, in return, to love and adore Him—the sovereign—and to admire and extol the glory of His reign.

The dominion of Christ, being essentially *righteous* as well as merciful and mild, *insures the full and final reward of the saints*, and their labors of love. So absolutely certain is this, that, according to the Saviour's own express declaration, not even a cup of cold water, given to any one in the name of a disciple, shall remain unrewarded. By thus providing for the full and exact remuneration of the saints, not as a reward of merit but of grace, the reign of Christ authenticates itself as just, and His throne is shown to be established in righteousness. Exactly in this circumstance of a just remuneration, consists either the excellence or the viciousness of an administration—in the matter, namely, of adjudging and meting out the rewards and punishments of the subjects, according to their individual merits and demerits. Right and duty always mutually condition each other. The rewards and punishments in any well-constituted government, are not arbitrarily fixed and meted out, but are settled and arranged according to the immutable principles of law. They must, if *just and right*, spring necessarily from the life and conduct of men—from the moral character of their actions. Does the dominion of Christ possess this peculiarity? Does His spiritual reign among men, and in the kingdom of grace, verify and meet this rational expectation? Undoubtedly it does—does so in the fullest sense of the terms. Listen how David, "the sweet singer of Israel," celebrates the goodness of the Lord and the justice of His dealings with the sons of men. "My days are like a shadow that declineth, and I am withered like grass; but Thou, O Lord, shalt endure for ever, and thy remembrance unto all generations.

Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion; for the time to favor her, yea, the set time is come."—"I have been young, and now am old; yet, have I never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." Such is the uniform method of God's dealings with His children, here, whether in their individual or collective capacity. The sceptre of our covenant God and Redeemer is a "sceptre of righteousness." It secures invariably the best interests of His children. The Merciful Saviour would fain gather even the rebellious and disobedient under the outspread wings of His protection. How sweet and charming is His invitation to the poor and oppressed. He says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." His undying love wept tears of friendship and of generous sympathy at the grave of Lazarus. With Him, "love is stronger than death—many waters cannot quench it." And shall not this pure and quenchless love be always the same, and continue to live beyond the cold stream of death, to shed its sweet fragrance there, and to mete out to His loving and obedient subjects the reward of their fidelity, their love, their obedience? Most assuredly the blessed Jesus will do all this and much more. He Himself tells us that He will graciously acquit them in the day of reckoning, and say unto them: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." He has in reserve for them an "inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Hence the gracious provisions of His kingdom, with its Word of life, its Holy Sacraments, its Offices of Devotion, or social and united worship—all of them designed and adapted to fit us for the heavenly kingdom. Everything looks in this direction. The founding of the Church—was it not intended to be a spiritual home for His children—a hospital, or moral infirmary for the soothing of their inner life, the healing of their spiritual infirmities? The appointment of the Holy Ministry—was it not designed to furnish them, in a living way, the bread of life? The stated means of grace—the Word and Sacraments—were they not

appointed for their spiritual perfection, their growth in grace, their preparation for heaven ? Even the blessed angels—"are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto them who shall be heirs of salvation ?" To every loving and obedient subject in this blessed kingdom of Christ, living under His mild sway and faithfully improving the means of grace there provided, He—the Head of the Church, will say: "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

This subject furnishes matter for profitable reflection to all classes of persons. The kingdom of Christ sustains an intimate and important relation to the present and future welfare of all men. There is no one who is excluded from its free offers of mercy. Christ came to be the Saviour of all men, and His redeeming work is *co-extensive* with the race of man. His love, the animating principle of this kingdom of grace, is boundless in extent, and resistless in power. All who come under its influence are saved. The honor of Christ is bound up in the salvation of men—in their present and future welfare. Hence, we may safely say, that the perpetuity and equity of Christ's mediatorial reign is no less becoming and honorable to the Redeemer Himself, than it is encouraging to His saints and terrible to His foes. In the holy oracles we read: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." How appropriate—how becoming to our Immanuel is this blessed dominion over the world ! How well does such wondrous power, the sceptre of universal dominion, befit that blessed hand, which, in tenderest love and winning condescension, was laid upon those innocent little babes that were carried to His arms—that hand of benediction, which taking the bread and cup, the blessed emblems of His body and blood, gave them unto His disciples, saying: "take, eat—take, drink—this is my body—this is my blood !" How gracefully does the royal diadem sit upon the Redeemer's brow ! And the "throne"—the expressive symbol of regal power and

authority—how well does it become Him, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords! No wonder that St. John, in his vision of heaven, heard the united song of “ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice: Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.” And how encouraging, also, is this reign of righteousness to the blessed sons of peace. They shall together with Christ be made heirs of an immortal life. Blessed, then, forever be the Son of God—the king of saints! “Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father—to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever—Amen.”

ART. VII.—THE DOCTRINE OF ANSELM ON THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

BY PROF. E. V. GERHART, D. D.

THE doctrine concerning the death of Jesus Christ, as definitely stated and formally elaborated by Anselm, is in principle the same as the doctrine subsequently more fully developed by Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Bullinger and other leading Reformers of the sixteenth century.* As modified and matured by the Reformers, this theory was accepted by both branches of the Evangelical Protestant Church, Reformed and Lutheran, and became a characteristic feature in all the Catechisms and

* Anselm was born at Aosta, Piedmont, 1033. His father was a nobleman. Predisposed to a religious life from early youth, he entered in his twenty-eighth year the monastery at Bec, Normandy, and became noted for the conscientious rigor with which he observed vigils, fasts, and all ascetic practices, also for the diligence and zeal with which he pursued his studies. After three years he became Prior. In 1078 he was unanimously chosen Abbot. In 1093, under William II, he became Archbishop of Canterbury. Twice he was exiled; first, under William II, for maintaining the rights and freedom of the Church, at whose death he returned to his see; and second, under Henry

Confessions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, approved and adopted by the various branches of the Orthodox Evangelical Church.

To review a theory which in past centuries found general acceptance and still commends itself to the hearts and consciences of large numbers of Christian people, may to some minds seem unwarranted or even presumptuous. Yet it must be borne in mind that it is a *theory* which we propose to consider historically, not to review an article of the creed. A theory has a human, not a divine origin. It is a part of theological science, not a fact of revelation. That Jesus Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; that He bore our sins in His own body on the tree; that through death Christ destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage;*—this truth, stated in manifold ways in the gospels and epistles, and summed up by the Apostles' Creed in the article: Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried;—this truth of Holy Scripture is undoubtedly an essential part of the Economy of Redemption; and to call it in question would be to join issue with a fundamental element of Christianity. But the scientific opinion of this truth, or the manner in which Christian thought has formularized it, is something very different. The one is a verity in the historical life and redemptive

(1103), for refusing, in obedience to the Pope, to take the oath of fealty to the King.

When Pope Paschalis II yielded the point at issue with England, Anselm returned; and from this time forth had the confidence and high regard of the Court. Anselm asserted the independence of the Church both against the encroachments of the Crown and of the Pope. He labored with much zeal for the reform of manners among the clergy and the laity. He was distinguished alike for his great practical activity, for his extensive learning, profound thought, logical acumen, and for his philosophical and theological works, which have secured for him the title of the father of mediæval scholasticism. He died 1109, in the seventy-eighth year of his age.

* Gal. iii. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 24; Heb. ii. 17.

work of our Lord, and is for our faith unchangeable, as His divine-human personality; the other is the form of apprehension developed in Christian consciousness, and is not unchangeable, but may vary and become more complete with the progress of Christian knowledge.

Certainly it is not unwarranted to assume that there may be much progress in the knowledge of Holy Scripture, and therefore also progress in theological science. We inherit the results of the earnest investigations and the scientific thinking of the learned scholars who have gone before us, and these results are a precious legacy which we cherish and honor; yet we rightly respect and honor them,—not when we accept as final the formulas which they have wrought out, and thus substitute their opinion of Scripture truth for the Scripture truth itself,—but when we follow their example by studying Scripture as prayerfully as they did, and by reflecting on the verities of revelation as patiently and independently. Enriched by the theological thought of other times and by the labors of the interpreters of God's Word, it is both respectful to the framers of Confessions and legitimate to suppose that the church of the present day has likewise a mission to perform in the sphere of Exegesis and Dogmatics. And I cannot but take it for granted that the Protestant Church of the nineteenth century may tolerate freedom of inquiry as cordially as the Church of Rome did in the tenth century, when Anselm joined issue with Origen, Gregory Nyssa, Basil the Great, Augustine, Hillary, and a long line of great men, by renouncing the notion that the death of Christ was the payment of a debt due to the devil, and in its stead asserting and elaborating the principle that the self-sacrifice of the God-man was a necessity demanded by penal justice.

Prior to Anselm, we may distinguish among the leading representatives of theological thought two distinct currents of opinion respecting the sacrifice offered on the cross. The one reproduces the Scriptural mode of representation, that Christ died, the Just for the unjust, to bring us unto God. The other lays stress chiefly on Satan's dominion over fallen man, and the

necessity of purchasing man from Satan by means of a ransom. That ransom was the life of Jesus Christ. The latter was the theory generally accepted from the time of Irenæus (202), who probably first advocated it, onward for at least ten centuries, and may be properly regarded as the accepted doctrine of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches during that period.

The essential feature in this doctrine is that Christ was subjected to death in order thereby to deliver man from Satan's authority and power. Theologians differed on two questions; first, whether Satan had a just claim to such a ransom; and, secondly, whether God deceived Satan in the transaction. Irenæus recognized merely the general fact, that man had fallen a prey to Satan, by whom he was held in bondage. Origen (250) takes a step in advance of Irenæus on this line of thought—maintaining that Satan had a rightful ownership in his subjects, and therefore could justly demand a ransom price for their release. Gregory Nyssa (394) goes still further. He teaches that God in His wisdom took advantage of Satan's ignorance. Satan demanded the sinless soul of Jesus; Jesus was willing to yield himself in death to the power of Satan, but the Deity of Jesus was hiddeu; hence, when Satan laid hold of Jesus, he was overcome by the God-man, and his subjects were delivered from the thraldom of his dominion.

This notion of a contract with Satan, Augustine (430) develops into a juridical process. Satan by deception had betrayed Eve into voluntary submission to his will, and the human race by thus obeying his will became his rightful possession. The Son of God in turn subjugates Satan to Himself, and He does it strictly in a righteous way. The Incarnate Son, pure, sinless and holy, who has done nothing deserving the penalty of the cross, Satan most unjustly puts to death, and thereby forfeits his right to the subjects of his kingdom, and his jurisdiction over them ceases. All who believe in Jesus partake of this victory over Satan. Ambrose, (398) Leo the Great (461) and Gregory the Great (500) insist on the same doctrine. Leo emphasizes especially the rightful claim of Satan to a ransom, and defi-

nitely teaches that Satan became the victim of deception;* whilst Gregory revives the opinion of Irenæus, denying that Satan had any rights which God was bound to respect.

The same doctrine was likewise taught, more or less decidedly, by John of Damascus (720), Nicholas of Methone† (1166), Bernard of Clairvaux, and indeed by nearly all theological writers onward through the tenth and eleventh centuries. All historical evidences support the assertion that from the time of Irenæus, for not less than a thousand years, the idea of a transaction with the devil, or an exchange of our Lord's life for the surrender of Satan's subjects, was the predominant theory respecting the necessity of Christ's death.

Against the almost universal sentiment that a debt was due to Satan which Jesus acknowledged and paid by the offering of His life, Anselm advanced and defended the principle, that the necessity of the death of Christ was referable to the judicial relationship between God and man. Yet this idea did not originate with him. He was rather the organ of a tendency of thought which had been enunciated more or less distinctly and definitely from the time of Irenæus—a tendency that runs parallel with the reigning doctrine, though it always occupied a subordinate place, and never exerted any controlling influence upon theology or in the religious history of the people.

* The deception practised on Satan was illustrated by the figure of a mouse-trap, or a snare set for birds. A favorite comparison, perhaps oftener employed, was the art of fishing. The human flesh of Christ was the bait, and His concealed Deity the strong hook. The stupid leviathan eagerly swallowed the bait, and then found himself caught.

† I subjoin the following passage cited by Hagenbach in his *Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. II, p. 119, from John of Damascus, who is commonly regarded as the last great theologian of the pre-medieval Greek Church: "For He who is both our Creator and our Lord taketh upon Himself the conflict of him who bore His image, and becometh indeed our teacher. And when the enemy beguileth man with the hope of attaining unto the divine nature, He, under the veil of our flesh, winneth man unto Himself, and showeth at once the goodness and the wisdom, the righteousness and the power of God: His goodness, in that He did not overlook the weakness of him who bore His image, but had compassion on him when he fell, and reached out His hand to help him: His

The idea that Christ made satisfaction for our sins is expressed by Irenæus. He says that Christ by His obedience unto death, had made good our disobedience, and thereby had paid our debts that we might have forgiveness of sins. Irenæus lays hold of the positive rather than the negative aspect of satisfaction ; and, in his mode of theological thought, this conception had more influence than the opinion that redemption was a transaction with the devil.

Hilary (368) expresses himself in general terms : The Logos, he says, freely took upon Him suffering, in order to fulfill the necessity of punishment. Ambrose expresses himself in words of equivalent import : that Christ bore the sentence of condemnation which demanded death for the transgression of sinful flesh.

Athanasius (673) reasons thus in support of the opinion that Christ became a substitute : God is bound to fulfill His word : thou shalt surely die. Yet it was not worthy the goodness of God to allow fallen man, who had been seduced into transgression by Satan, to be lost. As the Logos knew that man could be saved from sin in no other way than by the suffering of death, He, because Himself immortal, took upon Himself man's mortal body, in order that by possessing a mortal body He who is above all might satisfy the claims of death for all, and thus through the inhabitation of the immortal Logos, man's ruin might be brought to an end. He gave His body a sinless sacrifice to death, and by the offering of this equivalent substitute,

righteousness, in that when man was overpowered, He doth not make another being to crush the tyrant, nor doth He rescue man from death by violence, but in His goodness and righteousness He hath made Him, whom death, by reason of sin, hath long held in bondage, to be again victorious, and, what otherwise was impossible, hath saved like by like : His wisdom, in that He hath found for him a most glorious deliverance out of his distress. For that the children of the Lord were made like unto him who had usurped authority over them could not be. Therefore death draweth nigh, and when he hath swallowed the body that was set as a bait for him, becometh impaled on the hook of Deity, and because he has feasted on a body that was sinless and life-giving, doth fall into utter destruction and vomiteth up even all those whom he long ago hath swallowed."

He took away death from all who were of the same nature. Thus He fulfilled for all what was due to death, and by virtue of His sameness of nature He, the Immortal One, clothed all with immortality.

From Augustine the following passage may be cited, which sounds as if he was in full sympathy with the satisfaction theory of Anselm: Christ, who was Himself innocent, took upon Him the punishment due to us, in order thus to cancel our debts and put an end to our punishment. Passages of similar import might be cited from Cyril of Jerusalem (386) and even from the writings of Origen.

In all these writers, however, the opinion that redemption by the death of Christ was the ransom price paid to Satan in exchange for man's deliverance from Satan's dominion, is the principal doctrine. With this dominant doctrine the opposite opinion co-exists, but does not logically cohere. The force of the biblical teaching which relates redemption by Christ to God is seen and felt. Hence such expressions as we have cited occur respecting the vicarious sacrifice; but the idea of a sacrifice offered to God is not wrought into harmony with the prevailing principle. Many leading theologians represent both tendencies of thought: * the one as the primary and controlling doctrine, the other as a secondary opinion seeking with greater or less strength to assert itself as truth.

* In illustration, we cite a passage from Nicholas of Methone: "For our whole race was subject unto death, for all men did sin, and the sting of death is sin (1 Cor. xv. 56), and with it death has wounded and slain us. and otherwise than through death it was not possible that those who had been taken captive should be released from the chains of their bondage (Rom. v. 14). For the ransom to be paid dependeth upon the choice of those who hold (the captives). There was, then, no one who was able to undertake the task, and to redeem the race; no one of those who belonged to the race was free. For a man doth hardly set himself free from his individual responsibility, and though he die for himself he hath not the power to deliver a single being along with himself. And if he deliver no single being, who was there powerful enough to redeem a whole universe from its bondage. For if each individual had power sufficient to effect his own liberty, it still was not to be expected that all men should die, nor that they should remain under the power of death.

In this respect Gregory Nazianzum (390) differs from all other theologians belonging to the Nicene age. He says: "If the ransom is to be paid to none other than to him who has subjected man to his dominion, I ask, to whom was the offering made, and for what reason? Was the ransom made to the Evil One? Away with such folly! Then the robber would not only receive from God a ransom, but receive God Himself, and thus get an infinite reward for his tyranny." Touching the theory of satisfaction made to God, Nazianzum may justly be regarded as the forerunner of Anselm.

This doctrine of redemption Anselm unfolds and defends in his work entitled: *Cur deus homo?* written in the form of a dialogue between Boso and the author. He boldly joins issue with the doctrine then generally accepted. "God owed nothing to the devil, but punishment; and man owed him nothing, but retaliation; in order that man might overcome Him by whom he had been overcome; but whatever was required of man, this he owed to God, not to the devil."

Who, then, possessed the power of final victory? Evidently one who was without sin. And of all beings who but God alone was without sin? Therefore, seeing that it was a work for God to do, and that it could not be accomplished without death, and the pains that precede death, He took upon Himself a nature that was subject to pain and death, and that was in all things of the same essence with us and wholly like unto us. And He at the same time gave to death, His antagonist, an opportunity against the flesh, and was resolved to conquer him by means of the very nature that was subject unto him, in order that he might have no room to say that he had been overpowered, not by man, but by God; and also that we might not grow weary in our conflicts, seeing that we should have an example of one who in the fulness of time called (to Himself) the flesh that was of the same nature and essence (with His), and in which sin was condemned because it had found no abiding place in it." See Hagenbach's *Doctrine History*, Vol. II, Art. 180.

It has been a matter of uncertainty when Nicholas, Bishop of Methone lived. Agreeably to an opinion formerly current, Hagenbach assigns him a place prior to Anselm, and says of him, that he (Nicholas) "arrived at similar conclusions with Anselm, though independently of him." But, according to the results of Ullman's researches, Nicholas of Methone flourished during the latter half of the 12th century. If this be correct (and it seems to be better supported than the other), the probability is that the opinions of Nicholas on Redemption were formed under the influence of Anselm's doctrine. *

In developing a contrary doctrine, Anselm starts with the idea of God's honor. This is the principle on which the argument turns, and from which it derives its significance. As God is the Creator of all things, the Author of angels and men, whose authority is supreme in heaven and on earth, His honor consists in this, that all creatures freely subject themselves to His authority and obey His will. From this point of view Anselm sets forth the condition and character of man as a sinner; and the negative conception of sin enters into his construction of the doctrine of redemption. The obedience due from man to God's will, or the subjection of himself to the divine majesty, man withholds from God, and thus dishonors Him. Thus man commits sin. Sin consists in withholding the honor which is due to God. "He who renders not to God this honor due to Him, withholds from God what is His own, and dishonors God; and this is to sin.* So long as he does not relinquish that of which he has robbed God, he continues in guilt. Nor is it enough to make return of that only which was taken away; but for the dishonor committed, man is bound to return more than he took away."

Then he presents the necessary alternative. Either man

* The negative conception of sin was common among the Greek and Latin theologians. Augustine regarded it as a turning from the greater good to the less good; a falling away from that which is supreme to that which is inferior; a perverseness of the will, which is diverted from the highest essence to that which is base. Athanasius believed sin to consist in the blindness and indolence of man, which prevent him from elevating himself to God. Yet in all these definitions, the church held fast the position that sin was in contradiction to God's purposes. According to Julius Miller, Augustine "everywhere remains true to the denial of the divine origination of sin." A more positive conception appears definitely after the time of Augustine. Gregory the First (590), distinguishes between *peccatum* and *delictum*; *peccatum* is to do the evil, but *delictum* is to turn away from the good. John of Damascus (720), adheres to the negative. Evil, he says, is nothing else than a withdrawal from the good. With this definition of John of Damascus Anselm concurs, and expresses himself in nearly the same words: "Non est itaque aliud peccare, quam Deo non reddere debitum."

must restore to God that which is God's due, or for this dishonor done to God man must suffer the penalty of death. "It was necessary, therefore, that either the honor taken from God be returned, or that punishment must follow; otherwise either God will not be just to Himself, or He will be impotent; and this it is unlawful even to think."

Yet just here Anselm weakens if he does not cut, the nerve of his own principle. Whilst the force of the argument hinges on God's honor, God is somewhat deistically held asunder from man and the universe. Whether man subjects his will to divine authority, or arbitrarily withholds this honor due the Divine Majesty, God living His exalted and independent life in the realm of eternal glory is by man's conduct unaffected. The harmony of the universe is interrupted, but the honor of the Being who formed, upholds and governs the universe is in either case absolutely the same. "It is impossible for God to lose His own honor. The honor of God as pertaining to Himself cannot be either increased or diminished. For His own honor is the same, incorruptible, and in no manner changeable. When any creature, whether naturally or consciously conforms to its established law, it is said to obey God, and thus to honor Him; and above all a rational nature which has the power to know what it ought to do. The being that chooses to do the thing that it owes, honors God; not because he bestows upon God anything, but because he subjects himself to God's will and disposal, and maintains his own position in the universe as well as the harmony of this universe as this is in itself. But when he does not will what is due, he in his relation to this order dishonors God, in as much as he does not subject himself to the disposal of God, and thus disturbs the order and the beauty of the universe as this is in itself; though he by no means injures or tarnishes either the power or majesty of God." Nevertheless the argument supporting the necessity that man render satisfaction to God by the payment of the penalty, proceeds on the silent assumption that man in with-

holding obedience from God did, by disturbing the harmony of the universe,* dishonor God Himself.

The relation of God to man is juridical. Man must honor God, either by obedience to God's will, or if he withhold this obedience by suffering the penalty. Either the one or the other God's honor demands. God therefore cannot exercise His authority in the way of mercy toward those by whom He has been dishonored. "It is unworthy of God that He should pardon sin. If mercy alone would pardon, unrighteousness would be more privileged than righteousness."

Hence God's righteousness requires that man make payment by suffering the punishment of death. But this cannot be done. "Man cannot make this satisfaction because he is perverted by sin." The sinner must endure the penalty of death, but his death does not satisfy the demands of justice.

God must provide a remedy; and the remedy must include the suffering of the penalty of death. The being who is subject to the penalty of transgression must himself make satisfaction to God's justice by the payment of the debt. Anselm says: "It was fitting that just as by the disobedience of man death entered into the human race, so by the obedience of man life be restored; and as sin, which was the cause of our

* The idea respecting man generally accepted in mediæval times was that he had been created to take the place of the fallen angels in the heavenly world. God's plan of the universe included a definite number of angelic spirits. The apostasy of Satan and his host frustrated this plan. To complement the deficiency in the celestial kingdom man was formed, and the design of God was that the number of human individuals should be equal to the number of the angels which have fallen, that thus God's original purpose might be fulfilled, and the beauty of the universe restored. When man sinned and turned away from God he failed to accomplish this purpose, and thus disturbed the order and harmony of creation. This opinion is definitely presented in the *Cur Deus Homo*, and stands as one of the premises of the argument supporting the author's doctrine of redemption. "A. It was proper that God should design to make up for the number of angels that fell, from human nature which He created without sin. B. This is a part of our belief, but still I should like to have some reason for it. * * * * * A. There is no question that intelligent nature, which finds its happiness, both now and

condemnation, had its beginning in woman, so the author of our righteousness and salvation should be born of woman, and that the devil, who enticed man by the fruit of the tree and overcame him, should likewise by man be overcome by his passion on the tree."

Boso asks whether God might not have created a sinless man as He created Adam, a man who might make payment to justice by means of death, and thus supersede the necessity of the incarnation? Anselm replies that this is conceivable, but argues against the assumption from the consequences which would follow. Redeemed men would then become the possession and servants of this human redeemer, and this would contravene the purpose of man's creation, who was formed to be the servant of God. "If any other being should rescue man from eternal death, man would rightly be adjudged as the servant of that being. Now, if this be so, he would in no wise be restored to that dignity which would have been his had he never sinned. For he, who was to be through eternity only the servant of God and an equal with the holy angels, would now be the servant of a being who was not God, and whom the angels did not serve."

The question then arises whether some being higher than man, an angel, might not pay to God the price of man's redemption? Anselm replies in the negative. For it is necessary, in the contemplation of God, was foreseen by Him in a certain reasonable and complete number, so that there would be an unfitness in its being either less or greater. For either God did not know it was best to create rational beings, which is false; or, if He did know, then He appointed such a number as He perceived most fitting. Wherefore, either the angels who fell were made so as to be within that number; or, since they were out of that number, they could not continue to exist, and so fell of necessity. But this last is an absurd idea. B. The truth which you set forth is plain. A. Therefore, since they ought to be of that number, either their number should of necessity be made up, or else rational nature, which was foreseen as perfect in number, will remain incomplete. But this cannot be. B. Doubtless, then, the number must be restored. A. But this restoration can only be made from human beings, since there is no other source."

sary that he who would make satisfaction must bring to God something greater than all that is in God's possession; but he who would bring something of his own to God that is greater than all things in the universe, must himself be greater than all in the universe except God. Therefore God must make this satisfaction, and yet it is man who ought to make it for himself. Hence the conclusion is expressed thus by Anselm: "If it be necessary, therefore, as it appears, that the heavenly kingdom be made up of men, and this cannot be effected unless the aforesaid satisfaction be made, which none but God can make, and none but man owes to God, it is necessary for the God-man to make it."

Anselm proceeds to show that this new man must be of the race of Adam; for it was this race that had sinned, and none other owed it to God to make satisfaction for sin. Moreover, it is most fitting that this new man be born of a woman. There are four ways in which God may create a human being: 1. Either of man and woman, as men commonly are born; 2. Or neither of man nor of woman, as Adam was formed; 3. Or of man alone, as God made Eve; 4. Or of woman alone. For the whole of humanity is in either sex. The latter mode was reserved for this very purpose, and was suitable, because the woman was first in the transgression. Moreover, it was fitting that she be a virgin, as it is self-evident that it is more worthy of the God-man that He be born of a virgin than of a woman who is not a virgin.*

He next assigns various reasons why it was becoming and necessary that of the three persons in the Holy Trinity the Son, not the Father, should become man. It was proper that the Son of God should become the Son of Mary, and that the Son on earth should pray to the Father in heaven, and not the Father on earth to the Son in heaven. He also argues from the incongruities that would have followed had the Father been conceived and born.†

* *Cur Deus Homo*, II. c. 8.

† "If one of the other persons be incarnated, there will be two Sons in the

In order that this God-man might make payment to God for the dishonor done Him by sinners, it was needful that He bring something of His own to God, not of debt, but of His own free will. If He had owed something to God from Himself, He could not have brought an offering for others. And that which must be brought to God to make satisfaction, must be greater than all things in God's possession. Obedience to God's law cannot be such an offering, for like all rational creatures this man likewise owes obedience to God; and that which a man owes to God, being God's due, cannot make satisfaction for the sin of others. The only remaining alternative is to lay down his life. To offer his life by dying is something which he does not owe to God. This offering was not necessary on His own account, for He is sinless and holy. He is able to die, and able not to die. In offering himself to death, not of obligation, but freely, and in doing this when, being omnipotent, He was able not to die, He brings something of His own to God, which was not due to God from Him, and which at the same time was greater than all else in the universe that is not God. Therefore His voluntary death is the full payment of what man owes to God on account of his sins, and the honor of God is vindicated. To this argument of Anselm, showing that, to make satisfaction to God, a redeemer must of his own account suffer the penalty of death, Boso responds thus: "I see it to be necessary that the man, whom we are seeking, must be one who does not die of necessity, inasmuch as he must be almighty, nor die under obligation because he will not be a transgressor; yet one who can die of free will because it is a necessary thing."

Trinity, viz., the Son of God, who is the Son before the incarnation, and He also, who, by the incarnation, will be the Son of the Virgin; and among the persons, which ought always to be equal, there will be an inequality as respects the dignity of birth. For the one born of God will have a nobler birth than He who is born of the Virgin. Likewise, if the Father become incarnate, there will be two grandsons in the Trinity; for the Father assuming humanity, will be the grandson of the parents of the virgin, and the Word, though having nothing to do with man, will yet be the grandson of the virgin, since He will be the Son of her Son."

Anselm argues still further, that the voluntary death of this perfectly righteous man is a full satisfaction to God for the dishonor of the sinner; because the offering of his life is the greatest sacrifice that a man can make. "Nothing more painful and more difficult can a man do to the honor of God than of his own accord, and not of obligation, to suffer death; and assuredly a man can rather give himself to God than surrender himself to death for the honor of God."

Special emphasis is laid on the fact that He suffers this death of His own free will. Because the act was voluntary it possesses an infinite value; for His death outweighs all sins, however numerous or great. "A. Consider, that sins are as hateful as they are evil, and that life is only amiable in proportion as it is good. And, therefore, it follows that that life is more lovely than sins are odious. B. I cannot help seeing this. A. And do you not think that so great a good, in itself so lovely, can avail to pay what is due for the sins of the whole world? B. Yes! It has even infinite value. A. Do you see then how this life conquers all sins, if it be given for them? B. Plainly. A. If, then, to lay down life is the same as to suffer death, as the gift of His life surpasses all the sins of men, so will also the suffering of death."

Inasmuch as the satisfaction made to God by the death of Christ has an infinite value, it has a retroactive influence, and extends to Adam and Eve, though they cannot be admitted into God's presence until after the sacrifice has actually been made. "Since all who are to be saved cannot be present at the sacrifice of Christ, yet, such virtue is there in His death, that its power is extended even to those far remote in place or time. We must not doubt that Adam and Eve obtained pardon in that forgiveness, though Divine authority makes no mention of this."

The argument reaches its culmination in the idea that the gift of the Son brought to God by offering His life a sacrifice possesses infinite value. His death was not only full payment for the sin of man, but in worth it exceeded inconceivably that

which God demanded. Right reason therefore teaches that the Father ought to reward the Son. A debt was due the Father from man. This the Son paid. But the payment was in point of dignity and value infinitely greater than what was due; and the Father became indebted to the Son. As the Father is infinite in justice and power, He cannot but bestow upon the Son a suitable reward. The Son, however, was Himself equal to the Father, and possessed all that the Father has. Hence He is incapable of receiving a reward; nevertheless a reward is due to Him. What, therefore, is more befitting than that the Father reward the Son by accrediting the Son's infinite merits to those for whom the Son died, and by giving authority to the Son to award His own merits to sinners, and thus save them from death? Herein the compassion of God is manifest; for He is willing that the reward due from Him to the Son shall avail for the forgiveness of those who by their sins have dishonored Him. His justice is satisfied by the Son, and His mercy can extend pardon to men on account of the Son's infinite merits. "Boso, I see, on the one hand, a necessity for a reward, and on the other, it appears impossible; for God must necessarily render payment for what He owes, and yet there is no one to receive it. Anselm. The reward then must be bestowed upon some one else, for it cannot be upon Him. B. I think it would be both just and necessary that the gift should be given by the Father to whomsoever the Son wished, because the Son should be allowed to give away what is His own. A. Upon whom would He more properly bestow the reward accruing from His death, than upon those for whose salvation, as right reason* teaches,

* The force of the argument does not rest directly on Scripture teaching, but principally on the dictates of right reason. Certain general conceptions of God, of divine justice, and of redemption by the death of Christ are assumed, and then being governed by these general conceptions, an appeal is made to the sentiment of propriety, or to that which is fit and becoming in itself for God to do or not to do. The *Cur Deus Homo* is a specimen of close dialectic reasoning on a mystery of revelation, with but little or no reference to the manner in which revelation sets forth that mystery.

He became man. Whom could He more justly make heirs of the inheritance, which He does not need, and of the superfluity of His possessions, than His parents and brethren? What more proper, than that, when He beholds so many of them weighed down by so heavy a debt, and wasting through poverty in the depth of their miseries, He should remit the debt incurred by their sins, and give them what their transgressions had forfeited?"

Justice and mercy are thus reconciled in the salvation of sinners, who cannot make payment to God of the debt which is due to Him. "Now we have found the compassion of God so great, and so consistent with His holiness, as to be incomparably above anything that can be conceived. For what compassion can excel these words of the Father addressed to the sinner doomed to eternal torments, and having no way to escape: "Take my only begotten Son, and make Him an offering for yourself;" or these words of the Son, "Take me and ransom your souls."

The argument of Anselm demonstrating the necessity of the death of Jesus Christ, which we have now given at some length, may be summed up in fewer words thus: Man by withholding the obedience due from him to God, has dishonored God. Justice vindicates God's honor by taking the life of the sinner: in other words, by inflicting the penalty of death. The penalty is the payment made to God in lieu of the obedience withheld. Mercy cannot remit the payment, because justice is inflexible. That the sinner may be saved, some one else must make payment in his stead. A righteous man or an angel cannot do it, because then the redeemed men would become the possession of a creature, and this would contravene the purpose of God in making man. Moreover the payment must be something which is not due to God; and the offering greater also than all in the universe which is not God; and that is none other than God Himself. Nevertheless man must make the payment; for the debt is due from him by whom the dishonor was done. Hence God must become man. But the sinless and righteous

life of Jesus cannot be the payment of the debt, inasmuch as such a righteous life is due from Jesus to His Father. The only alternative is death. For Jesus, being perfectly righteous, does not owe the Father this sacrifice. He who does not owe it to God to die, lays down His life of His own free will for the sinner. Thus the God-man discharges the debt which man owes to God. But as He who freely suffers death is true God and true man in one person, the payment made is infinitely greater than the payment which was due. Jesus in consequence has merits which He does not need for Himself. The relative position of the Son to the Father is changed. Now the Father is bound by justice to reward the Son. This reward due to Him from the Father, that is, the infinite merits acquired by this voluntary death, the Son imputes and applies to men in whose stead He offers Himself as a sacrifice. Thus the honor of God is maintained; the debt due to Him is fully paid; and for the sake of the infinite payment made by the Son, His mercy remits to sinners the penalty of death.

Judged in the light of the New Testament, there are some serious defects both in the theory and in the argument of this great mediæval theologian, several of which I shall briefly notice:

1. The idea of God's honor is the starting point of Anselm's reasoning, the hinge on which the dialectic process turns. But this idea is not held steadily and consistently. The sin of man, according to Anselm, in no sense touches the majesty and worthiness of God. Man's disobedience only invades the scheme, and disturbs the harmony of the universe. God in Himself is infinitely mighty, blessed and glorious, whether the plan of the universe be frustrated or fulfilled. Yet whilst sin absolutely does not affect God's being and majesty, but only disturbs the harmony of the universe, and thus only affects the grandeur and beauty of the world, God requires payment for sin to be made to Himself, as if He had been wronged personally, and His own honor had been directly tarnished.

2. The argument involves an issue between the Father and

the Son. The Father's justice inflexibly demands the infliction of the punishment of death; the Son does not thus demand the infliction of the penalty upon the transgressor; instead, His love to sinful man is so wonderful, that He humbles Himself to become man, and suffers a penalty not due to God from Himself. The Father accepts from the Son an excess of payment, and thus Himself in turn, becomes indebted to the Son.

But agreeably to the doctrine of the Trinity developed and established by the Ecumenical Councils, and held by Anselm himself, the Godhead of the Son and the Godhead of the Father are identical; the Father and the Son in the same sense possess all the essential attributes of Deity. The Father is love as the Son is love. The love of the Son to the world is no greater than the love of the Father; and the justice of the Father is not more inflexible than the justice of the Son.

Further, the condescension and love of the incarnate Son is so great that the payment which He makes to the Father is in excess of the payment due; and the excess is so great that the Father comes under obligation to the Son. There is here a transaction involving demand and payment, then payment and demand, between the Father and the Son; and the transaction is so external and mechanical that the notion is incompatible with God's essential unity, and with the life of absolute love subsisting in the communion of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Yet the notion of the Son's claim upon the Father and the Father's obligation to reward the Son for the excessive payment of the debt owed to God by man, is a strong link in the chain of the argument.

3. The argument assumes a like dualism between justice and mercy. Mercy sympathizes with the miseries of the sinner, and in order to relieve his miseries is disposed to remit the penalty. Justice on the contrary protects God's honor with unchanging firmness, and insists on the full payment of the penalty by the transgressor, unmoved by the pains and torments of the lost. God's mercy and God's justice join issue.

This notion is at war with the self-consistent and unchang-

ble harmony of God's nature. Justice is as compassionate as mercy; and mercy is as righteous as justice. Divine attributes are distinct, but not self-contradictory.

The controversy introduced by moral evil implies a false relation of the creature to the Creator, of the subject to his God, of the sinner to his Judge. The aim of Anselm is to set forth and establish a sound doctrine concerning the reconciliation of man to God by the death of Jesus Christ. But as the argument advances Anselm loses sight of the main objective point, and instead silently assumes a very different issue. From man the controversy is transferred to God. The logical force of the argument turns on an abnormal relation between justice and mercy, and the conclusion is the reconciliation of God with God. Of the incarnation of the Son, and of His death on the cross, the logical sequence is peace and harmony in the communion of God with Himself, a result which includes no necessary connection with the forgivenees of men's sins. Were it not for the ingenious device that Christ's death is an over-payment of debt due to God in consequence of which the Incarnate Son has an infinite surplus of merit, the entire dialectic process would fall short of its original aim. It would still be a question how God, consistently with justice, could remit the penalty of the transgressor, though the Incarnate Son had died on the cross.

4. The doctrine and the argument by which it is supported, both imply a mechanical conception of Christ's person and dignity. The God-man, as the theory runs, acquires infinite merits by dying a voluntary death, a death which obligation did not require Him to suffer. These merits, these claims to a reward from the Father, are for the Son Himself superfluous. He does not need them; He cannot use them. Therefore, He may at will transfer His merits to sinners who are hopelessly in debt, and thus obtain for them pardon and acceptance with God.

Evidently, according to this view, the worthiness of Christ is not in Christ Himself. He acquires His claims to a reward from the Father by an extraordinary and arbitrary act. It was not necessary to die; as He was not personally in debt to

the Father no payment of debt by dying could be required of Him. But He chose of His own accord to lay down His life for sinners. The merits acquired by this sacrifice have no internal connection with Himself, but are altogether external to Him. His merits are possessions, which, like gold and silver, He can distribute at will to the poor and needy. By an act of clemency He may transfer these possessions, these claims to God's favor, as by magic, to those who deserve condemnation. As they are external to the person of the Redeemer, so they may be imputed externally to the redeemed.

To say the least, such a notion of external association of Christ's merits with Himself is fanciful, and has no warrant in the New Testament. He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life. Christ's worthiness is in Himself, and of Himself. His merits are inseparable from His work; His work is inseparable from His life; and His life inseparable from His divine human person. The God-man is as such the Redeemer; and the Redeemer makes His work redemptive. The propitiatory virtue of the cross is commensurate with the sin-destroying virtue of Jesus Christ. The value of His sacrifice is no more nor less than His own worthiness.

5. A defect no less serious and far-reaching appears in Anselm's idea concerning the satisfaction of justice. The righteousness of God requires that the sinner make satisfaction for the dishonor he has done to God by withholding submission to God's authority. This satisfaction consists in suffering the penalty of death annexed to sin; and the penalty is held to be a debt which must be paid. The debt is paid, and the demand of justice is met when the sinner suffers temporal and eternal death. Anselm's notion concerning the satisfaction to justice rests on the principle that the relation between God and man is external, legalistic and commercial. He overlooks the profound truth that the reciprocal relation between man and God is internal, vital and ethical. God is love. In the image of divine love man has been created. God loves man because love to man is the profoundest impulse of the Divine Being, and be-

cause man is formed and designed to be the object of God's love. Of man the first and unchangeable demand of God's justice is that he live agreeably to the law and purpose of His divine image-ship and thus fulfill the end of his existence: "thou shalt love the Lord thy God." Man meets the demands of God; he satisfies the claims of justice; he discharges his obligations when from the heart he loves God and lives in the communion of love with Him. Nothing less than this can satisfy God's justice. The active love of man to God is just and right.

Accordingly it is unscriptural to lay it down as a fundamental proposition that the suffering of death meets all the demands of justice, or restores the honor of God. True obedience alone maintains God's honor. Justice indeed condemns sin; God pronounces the sentence of condemnation upon the sinner, and he cannot escape the penalty of transgression. But the justice of divine love remains unsatisfied, however great and abiding the anguish and torments endured by the transgressor. Justice condemns man so long as man does not love God with all the heart, and love his neighbor as himself.

This principle is valid in its application to the sacrifice of our Lord. His passion and death did not, as Anselm maintains, pay the whole debt due from man to God; nor is the problem solved by saying, however true may be the proposition, that the union of Deity with humanity imparted infinite dignity to His person and His death. The New Testament nowhere teaches that of Christ God demands only that He bear the curse of the violated law. It is undoubtedly true that Christ suffered the penalty of death, being made a curse for us; and that His death was both necessary and vicarious. But His death, as Anselm emphasizes it, did not meet the whole demand of justice. The demands of justice certainly our Lord could not have satisfied if He had not really laid down His life. Yet the value of His humiliation and passion does not consist only in the fact that He was condemned and under sentence of condemnation died on the cross; but the atoning value of the offering made by Him lies in this, that in Gethsemane and on the cross

He positively and perfectly fulfilled God's will. Jesus loved God with all His heart. He loved His neighbor as Himself. In His state of humiliation He obeyed God's law absolutely by living in the communion of love with God and with man without defect or flaw from the beginning to the end of His life. Thus He became the first and only man who in dying under the condemnation of sin fulfilled the righteousness and holiness of God. In death as in life, He loved God and man with a self-sacrificing love. The value of His sacrifice is both ethical and penal, both positive and negative. The offering of Himself on the cross is a satisfaction, because with the suffering of the death penalty the positive fulfillment of the law of love is ethically conjoined. All the claims of justice and love, penal and ethical, Jesus Christ meets by the life He lives and the death He dies.

In the elaborate doctrine of Anselm on the death of Jesus Christ there is one important scriptural truth: a truth which became the inheritance and the possession of the best theological thinkers of the mediæval age, Thomas Aquinas, Hugo of St. Victor, and many others, and especially became the possession of the Reformers of the Sixteenth century. This truth is the principle, that redemption from sin includes the sufferings and death of Christ as a vicarious and propitiatory sacrifice. Transgression and punishment are one and inseparable. Christ in accomplishing His work of redemption bore the penalty of man's transgression, and dissolved it. But by disconnecting the suffering of the death penalty from the positive obedience of our Lord, and regarding the requirements of God's law as fully met when the penalty of transgression is endured, thus ignoring the original, unchangeable and deeper demands of positive love; demands, which so long as they are not really reciprocated by man's heart and life, render peace between God and man an impossibility, the theory of Anselm becomes a one-sided and defective conception. The theory, whilst it has eliminated from the doctrine of redemption the notion of a juridical transaction with the devil, and has carried the church onward to a

higher plane of Christian thought, nevertheless falls short of the full-orbed teaching of Holy Scripture. The lack of the positive element is a radical defect, and this defect has had a perverting influence on theological science and Christian experience.

The theory wrought out by Anselm became in principle the doctrine of redemption which was asserted and vindicated by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Whilst they did not discern its defects, they grasped the element of trust which it contained. This they developed, and modified in some important particulars. As thus modified, his idea of satisfaction has lived on in the teachings of the Protestant Church down to our time.

But it is the design of this paper to be only a historical review of the doctrine of Anselm on the death of Christ; and, therefore, I shall not consider the modifications of it introduced by the Protestant Reformation.

NOTE.—A number of articles that were designed for this number of the REVIEW must be held over for want of room. We hope the worthy contributors will have patience to wait for the next number.